

BR
C559
v. 16
no. 4

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS

ERNEST G. SCHWIEBERT, *ex officio*

VOL. XVI

December, 1947

No. 4

Contents of previous issues of *CHURCH HISTORY* may be found by consulting the *International Index to Periodicals* in your library.

PACIFIC COAST NUMBER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE TERMS "LOCI COMMUNES" AND "LOCI" IN MELANCHTHON <i>Quirinus Breen</i>	197
THE WILL AND THE UNDERSTANDING IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF JONATHAN EDWARDS <i>H. G. Townsend</i>	210
THE CONFLICT BETWEEN QUEEN ELIZABETH AND ROMAN CATHOLICISM <i>Henry M. Shires</i>	221
THE RELIGIOUS BACKGROUNDS OF INDONESIAN NATIONALISM <i>Paul B. Means</i>	234
IN MEMORIAM <i>Edited by Raymond W. Albright</i>	248
AMONG THE MEMBERS <i>Edited by Winthrop S. Hudson</i>	249

CONTENTS

FRANK S. BREWER 1948 PRIZE ANNOUNCEMENT	250
REPORT ON THE PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE <i>A. S. C. H.</i> by <i>Quirinus Breen</i>	251
BOOK REVIEWS:	253
GRAYZEL, SOLOMON: <i>A History of the Jews</i>	Moses Bailey
SANTONASTASO, GIUSEPPE: <i>Le Dottrine politiche da Lutero a Suarez</i>	Roland H. Bainton
BERGSTRÄSSER, ARNOLD, ED.: <i>Deutsche Beiträge zur geisti- gen Ueberlieferung</i>	William A. Mueller
FROOM, LEROY EDWIN: <i>The Prophetic Faith of Our Fa- thers, III</i>	Frank H. Yost
BRIGHAM, CLARENCE S.: <i>History and Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820</i>	Gaylord P. Albaugh
RECENT ARTICLES ON CHURCH HISTORY Compiled by <i>J. H. Nichols and M. L. Hutchins</i>	

THE TERMS "LOCI COMMUNES" AND "LOCI" IN MELANCHTHON

QUIRINUS BREEN

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

Philip Melancthon was the author of the first book of Protestant theology, which he called *Loci communes rerum theologicarum seu hypotyposes theologicae* (Wittenberg, 1521).¹ As a first it is worth some study, for firsts are likely to be models for later things of their kind. Moreover, while Melancthon is by some considered to depart from early Protestant thought (cf. Philippism), Luther gave unqualified and almost extravagant praise to his young collaborator's first work.² This justifies putting at least the 1521 edition in the fundamental canon of Protestantism. Finally, if such is its importance Melancthon's method deserves examination.

Certain traits of his method are revealed in the terms *loci communes* and *loci*, either of which appears often in the titles of his systematic theological books. Exposition will be made under these heads: (1) a history of the terms since Aristotle; (2) Melancthon's use and explanation of the terms; (3) some conclusions.

I

Aristotle's *Topica* is the first book of its kind.³ In it he intended to bring system into the art of dialectics. As such he considered it an altogether original work. His topics (*topoi*) were in his view a part of comprehensive knowledge, but they pertain only to probable statements. They are a mere collection of points of view to be considered as resting on probable premises guaranteeing only probable conclusions. To give some order to the topics he groups them under "the four titles" (later made five by Porphyry, and known as *quinque voces*). His four

¹ *Corpus Reformatorum* (hereafter *C. R.*) XXI, 59-230.

² *C. R.*, XXI, 78.

³ For information on Aristotle's *Topica* I have found useful George Grote's *Aristotle*, 2 vols., London, 1872; W. D. Ross, *Aristotle*, London, 1930; Carl von Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*, Dritter Band, Leipzig, 1927; and of course the *Topica* itself. Quintilian undoubtedly knew the *Rhetoric* (*Inst. Orat.*, III, i, 14).

titles are accidents, genus, property, and definitions. He expressly says this division is not derived from a genuine principle of division, and that it is not a complete classification. This allowed later writers to add new titles to Aristotle's four. It became common to add even the titles themselves to the *loci*. Hence it is that the titles (accident, genus, property, definition) under which Aristotle had subsumed his *loci* became themselves topics or *loci*. Porphyry thus deals with the five titles (*quinque voces*) and connects these with the Aristotelian categories. Hence it is that in scholastic dialectic the five titles stand on a parity with the categories. Aristotle had forbidden to add the titles to the categories when he determined that each of the four should stand under one of the categories.⁴

It is evident that Aristotle wanted dialectics to aim at the truth. But in dialectical propositions exact truth can only be approximated, often only distantly. Certainty or exactitude is out of the domain of dialectics. That later teachers put topics on the same plane with the categories indicates that something had happened to the topical treatment of things to be known. Something had indeed taken place. Not long after Aristotle, his *Topica* became more generally used and very much better known than even his works on logic, the *Prior* and the *Posterior Analytics*. For a long time Aristotle's works as we know them (save the *Topica*) were lost; known only were a number of his works (now lost) which were written in a "Ciceronian" style. Thus it is that Cicero knew only the *Topica* of all the Aristotelian books which have come down to us.⁵

While Aristotle was pleased with his *Topica*, he did not think of it as his most solid achievement. The *Topica*, and the *Sophistical Refutations* which belongs to it, are but part of the *Organon*. A solidier part of the *Organon* is embodied in the *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics*. If the *Topica* is concerned with dialectics or probable propositions, the *Analytics* (particularly the *Posterior*) pertain to certain knowledge. One of the most frequently raised questions in Aristotle is that of the difference between certainty and probability, or knowledge and opinion.

4 August Faust, "Die Dialektik Rudolf Agricolas. Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik des deutschen Humanismus," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*. XXXIV Band, Neue Folge, XXVII Band, (Berlin, 1922), 120-1.

5 Grote, *Aristotle*, chapter II, "The Aristotelian Canon," discusses the problem at length. Opinions differ, some saying that Cicero knew none of Aristotle's works as we know them; others allow of the *Rhetoric* as well as the *Topica*. That Cicero had the *Topica* in his library is evident from his own *Topica*.

He is convinced that science is possible, that knowledge is distinguishable from opinion. Doubtless many reflecting men had had the same persuasion before, but Aristotle is the first to work out a syllogistic system whereby it is possible to tell a necessarily true from a probable (and also a false) premise; and to show how deductions are made from true premises, which are just as true as those premises. By analytics he meant the same thing we call logic. Thus logic deals with propositions whose premises are necessarily true, dialectics with those whose premises are probable. It is evident that it would not occur to Aristotle to put the *Logic* or *Analytics* under the heading of dialectics. They are both in the *Organon* because by *Organon* he means an instrument with which one must be familiar in order to deal with philosophy. That is, one must be aware of the fundamental distinction between probability (and falsity) and certainty before entering upon the search for wisdom.

Now it is precisely this distinction which was largely neglected in the later schools of Greece and Rome. It is therefore striking that Cicero was expressly committed to the view of the New Academy, that a man can only approximate the truth. Certainty is not attainable; all conclusions are at best probable. A basic assertion in the *Academica* is that a philosopher never makes a rash statement.⁶ The greatest rashness is the claim of certainty. This position fits the circumstance that Cicero knew only Aristotle's *Topica* which pertains to probable propositions only. Most of the schools of Greece and Rome reinforced this position, for their objective was that of turning out orators. The Isocratean tradition prevailed. The orator of course deals in forensic, deliberative, and epideictic discourse; in all of which it is the aim to be perfect rhetorically, that is, to have clear, agreeable, and persuasive speech. The subject-matter of discourse is explored and put in order by dialectic. This is done by that part of dialectic known as *topica*; that is, by means of *topoi* or *loci* a subject matter is dug out and arranged. The dialectical topic or *locus* does no more than find—is therefore called dialectical *inventio*—that is, it produces and arranges only the bare matter of things to be discoursed on. Rhetoric (by rhetorical *inventio*) finds or provides words that are understood by a mixed group, it adds polish and ornament

⁶ *Academica*, I, 4, 3-46; II, 7, 8; and *passim*. Cf. also Introduction of James S. Reid to *M. Tulli Ciceronis Academica*, (London, 1885), 11 f., 55 f.

to make the matter agreeable, it uses thunder and lightning (if need be) to make it persuasive.

Here then are two views of knowledge, two views of the aim of education, even two views of man. That Aristotle took both into account is clear from the attention he gave to rhetoric and dialectic on the one hand, and to scientific or certain knowledge (in the logic) on the other. But he takes the latter more seriously. Hence there is in him the view that man finds his fulfilment in contemplation of the truth. His contemporary, Isocrates,⁷ had a different view, holding that the end of education is to turn out a well-spoken man who through speech can further the noblest ideals for conduct in society. Knowledge is not an end in itself or an object of enjoyment through contemplation; it is an instrument to use socially. Man is not primarily a rational being; he is primarily a social being. Man achieves his highest development in the orator. This Isocratean ideal is voiced by Cicero, and is later elaborated by Quintilian.⁸ There is no significant challenge of this ideal till Neoplatonism which in turn influenced young Augustine to break with the New Academy.⁹

We can now sum up the argument by stating the difference between Aristotle's *topoi* or *loci* and Cicero's *loci*. To Aristotle they are merely points of view from which a probable proposi-

7 The orations of Isocrates (B. C. 436-338) are the best introduction to his views and methods. I recommend especially the *Antidosis*, *Panathenaicus*, *Panegyricus*, and *Against the Sophists*. George Norlin's Introduction, pp IX-LI, to his translation of Isocrates for the *Loeb Classics* (1928) is very useful, particularly for his careful references to the text. See also Jebb, *Attic Orators* (London, 1893), II; and "Isocrates" in *Pauly-Wissowa* (1916). Theodor Chalon Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology* (Chicago, 1902), III, 89-261, is rich in material and suggestion. A good study is August Burk, *Die Pädagogik des Isokrates als Grundlegung des humanistischen Bildungs-ideals* (Würzburg, 1923).

8 Cicero, *De Oratore*, II, 94, calls Isocrates "magister rhetorum omnium," and "from his school as from a Trojan horse went forth leaders only." Quintilian calls him "clarissimus ille praeceptor" (*Inst. Orat.*, II, viii, 11); he reports Aristotle's snide remark (III, i, 14); in XII, x, 22 he says the school of Isocrates produced "principes oratorum." The thesis of Burk's book (cf. note 7) is that the concept of education associated with the name of Isocrates has been widely celebrated, but in terms of study and advocacy of Cicero and especially Quintilian. The vigor of the schoolish tradition in which Cicero and Quintilian worked can be even better felt from a reading of Isocrates than the Romans.

9 One should not be unmindful of men like Dio Chrysostom (c. A. D. 40-120) when putting a higher estimate on Neoplatonism. For the latter and St. Augustine, cf. the latter's *Confessions*, Book VII, also his *Contra Academicos*; C. Boyer, *L'Idée de Vérité dans la philosophie de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1920), 17ff.; James S. Reid, *Academica*, 168.

tion may be looked at. His aim is to make dialectics as responsible to truth as it is possible. He knew there had always been a relation of dialectics to rhetoric—that rhetoric dresses up dialectical propositions for purposes of persuasion. Thus he wanted to make rhetoric more responsible to the truth; but he was aware that through rhetoric exactitude or precision cannot be attained in knowledge. The basic difference in Cicero is that he does not believe in any but probable statements. Therefore with him dialectics is everything as a means of discovering knowledge. The chief tool of dialectic as a finder of knowledge is the topic or *locus*. The *loci* are now no longer mere points of view. They are *sedes argumentorum*, i. e., the veins within a subject matter in which we dig for knowledge of it. They are the pits from which we pull up learning. Bearing in mind that Cicero's *loci* discover for us the only kind of knowledge that exists, it is understandable that he magnified the *loci* far beyond the bounds set by Aristotle.¹⁰

In the Middle Ages the *loci* continue in dialectics as part of the *trivium*. St. Augustine had not discarded the liberal arts of the pagan schools. But, thanks to Boethius, there was some knowledge of the *Analytics*, enough to realize that there is a distinction to be drawn between knowledge and opinion, between convincing and persuading. Fulbert of Chartres (d. 1028) does no more than clearly distinguish dialectics and rhetoric, but the distinction made clearly was very important, for dialectics was then not subordinated to rhetoric.¹¹ It becomes much clearer in the schoolmen from Anselm to Thomas Aquinas. That which kept churchmen from falling into the New Academy was the belief that there are things that are certain, namely, the body of the received faith. After Anselm, largely speaking, those were considered heretics who dealt with the articles of faith by means of dialectics, that is, as probable propositions; while those were considered orthodox who held that the articles of faith are in part expressible in propositions necessarily true. This helps explain the vogue of Aristotle in the thirteenth century. At bottom of the great conflict in scholas-

10 Faust, *Die Dialektik Agricolas*, 120, makes the distinction clear between Cicero's and Aristotle's topic or *locus*. Some do not sharply enough differentiate, or do not differentiate at all; see below note 26.

11 A. Clerval, *Les Ecoles de Chartres au Moyen Age, du V and XVI siècle* (Paris, 1899), is still unsurpassed. Ch. Plister, *De Fulberti Carttonensis episcopi Vita et Operibus* (Nancy, 1885), records Fulbert's "Rithmus de distantia Dialectice et Rhetorice," with comment, pp. 6, 33f.

ticism between realism and nominalism concerned the question whether the natural reason can know the *summum bonum* at all.

Their quarrels became over-refined, and in the opinion of many the schoolmen had largely lost touch with realities.¹² This can be said certainly of the period since Ockham's death. This period is the same in which Petrarch was getting considerable notice. Many, though by no means all, intellectuals lost taste for scholastic methods when the classical literature wove its spell upon them. Since Melanchthon belongs to northern humanism, only the men who more or less directly influenced him need be touched on. These are Rudolph Agricola (d. 1485) and Erasmus. Both knew Italian humanism at first hand. Both, however, were of the serious northern cast of mind, interested in ethical and religious reform. Agricola made random use of scholastic dialectic when it served his purpose, and Erasmus at one time admired Aquinas. But both are concerned more deeply with knowledge found in the Ciceronian manner than in the Aristotelian. Through them Cicero's *loci* got a wide reception in Northern Europe. Agricola sought by the *loci* to reconstitute all knowledge; Erasmus (in addition to that) sought more particularly to reinterpret Christianity by *loci* belonging to ethics. Melanchthon was influenced by Agricola first, no doubt, in his Heidelberg days (1509-12); later by Erasmus. In a sense Melanchthon is their most illustrious pupil. As a worker in the topical tradition the pupil has outshone his masters.¹³

12 Generalizations about the Renaissance era should be made with great caution. Everyone inclined to generalize about it should read Professor P. O. Kristeller, "Humanism and Scholasticism in the Italian Renaissance," *Byzantion*, XVII (1944-45), 346-374.

13 Cf. Paul Joachimsen, "Locī Communes; Eine Untersuchung zur Geistesgeschichte des Humanismus und der Reformation, *Luther-Jahrbuch* (Berlin, 1926) 27-97; it is a study of the *loci* of both Agricola and Erasmus with bearing upon Melanchthon; Faust, *Die Dialektik Agricolae*. See also P. Mestwerdt, *Die Anfänge des Erasmus* (Leipzig, 1917), 157 f. Christian Dolfen, *Die Stellung des Erasmus von Rotterdam zur scholastischen Methode* (Osnabrück, 1936). F. von Bezold, *Rudolf Agricola, ein deutscher Vertreter der italienischen Renaissance* (München, 1884). H. E. J. M. van der Velden, *Rodolphus Agricola (Roelof Huusman), een Nederlandsch humanist der vijftiende eeuw* (Leiden, n. d.). Lindeboom, *Het bijbelsch humanisme in Nederland* (Leiden, 1913), 58f., 58f., 112 f. K. Hartfelder, *Melanchthon als Praeceptor Germaniae* (Berlin, 1899), 12 f. Melanchthon's "Declamatio de vita Agricolae," *C. R.*, XI, 438 f. is a valuable source. His "Oratio de Erasmo Roterodamo," *C. R.*, XII, 264 f. merely recommends parts of Erasmus for his style.

II

A review of the titles of Melanchthon's theological book may yield interest and fruit. In the first period (1521-35) he uses the term *hypotyposes* by way of apposition to *loci communes* in the title of the 1521 and numerous other editions. In 1522 and 1523 he also brings out editions titled "Theological *hypotyposes*." This shows that he considers *hypotyposes* as a synonym for *loci*, interchangeable with it. This term belongs to rhetoric. Quintilian, discussing "ocular demonstration," speaks of "vivid illustration"; he then proceeds by saying that "others give the name of *hypotyposis* to any representation of facts which is made in such vivid language that they appeal to the eye rather than to the ear."¹⁴ Elsewhere Quintilian says that "*hypotyposis* or picturesque description cannot be regarded as a statement of facts."¹⁵ I take it that Melanchthon intended the *loci communes* to be understood rhetorically. *Hypotyposes* does not occur in the second period (1535-41), but he continues to use *loci communes*. During the third and last period, beginning 1543, *hypotyposes* again does not reappear; but now the title *Loci theologici* (without *communes*) is sometimes used. *Communes* still appears as late as 1558, but its place is often taken by *praecipui*. The succession of titles then has *Loci communes seu hypotyposes* (till 1535), *Loci Communes* (till 1541), *Loci communes*, *Loci praecipui*, or simply *Loci* (from 1543-1560).¹⁶

Now while the synonym *hypotyposes* shows that the *loci* of the first period are rhetorical; does its avoidance in the second and third periods indicate a departure from the rhetorical, that is, practical or homiletical emphasis? Is he becoming more philosophical, or rather dialectical, in the second and third periods? It would seem so from a comparison of the Introductions to the editions of 1521, 1535, and 1543. In 1521¹⁷ he writes: "The mysteries of divinity we more rightly adore than investigate," and he will not make much of "the highest *loci*: God, his unity and trinity, the mystery of creation, the manner

14 Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, translated by H. E. Butler (Loeb Classics, 1922, Book IX, ii, 40.

15 *Ibid.*, IV, ii, 3. The meaning is an unembellished statement of facts. Cf. Cicero, *De oratore*, III, liii, 202.

16 Bindseil's lists of editions of the three periods are in *C. R.*, XXI.

17 *C. R.*, XXI, 84.

of the incarnation." He also scorns as vain the concern of the scholastic "theologians" for including those *loci*. In his second period¹⁸ Melanchthon prefaces his work by calling attention to the importance of method, the proper order of the *loci*, and the necessity of repudiating philosophies (the Academics and Skeptics) which deny there is certainty in knowledge. Bindseil remarks¹⁹ that Melanchthon had come to realize "that many of his *loci* had to be treated more accurately by disputation." The books of the third period represent revisions which arose from the author's disputations, held at Worms and Ratisbon 1540 and 1541, with Eck, Cochlaeus, and others. His Preface (1543) shows he is more circumspect than ever and very formal.²⁰ He uses word for word certain parts from his *Erotemata Dialectices* on certainty in philosophy as compared (and contrasted) with religion.²¹ The conclusion is warranted that Melanchthon's theological *Loci* have moved toward dialectics. But, as will appear, Melanchthon's dialectic is, like Cicero's, an instrument of rhetoric; his theological dialectic is an instrument of homiletics.

A small treatise on the topical method appeared in 1531, 1532, 1533 in volumes which also contained Rudolph Agricola's *De formando studio* and Erasmus' *Ratio colligendi exempla*. Melanchthon's contribution was *De locis communibus ratio* (method or theory of commonplaces).²² In his *Elementa Rhetorices*, published 1542, is a section called "*De locis communibus*" (On Commonplaces).²³ In 1547 appeared, with revision in 1549, his definitive *Erotemata Dialectices* (Questions [and answers] on Dialectic), of which Book IV has the title "*De locis argumentorum*" (On the loci of subject matters).²⁴ In these writings Melanchthon expressly expounds the idea of the *locus*. The first two writings are interesting, but contain nothing that is not much better explained in the third. It is the last I must therefore discuss.

"*De locis argumentorum*"²⁵ begins by saying that the parts of dialectics are two: the one pertains to judgment which part

18 *Ibid.*, 254 f.

19 *Ibid.*, 230.

20 *Ibid.*, 561 f., 603 ff.

21 *Ibid.*, XIII, 650 f.

22 *Ibid.*, XX, 693 f.

23 *Ibid.*, XIII, 451-454.

24 *Ibid.*, XIII, 641-752.

25 *Ibid.*, XIII, 641.

covers what is generally learned in logic; "the other is invention or *topica*, which is the doctrine of *loci* which are so to say the indices of things to be either investigated or selected." An example of investigation by *loci* is a physician who finds a person with a rapid or an unsteady pulse. This he knows will be found in the *locus* called "on effects," where he recalls that a rapid pulse is caused by the heart and also what inflames the heart. An example of selection is that which belongs to religious doctrine; this is not to be found (*invenienda*) as a result of search; it is ready at hand in Scripture, and needs only to be selected, arranged, defined, and so on.

It must be noted that Melanchthon takes up logic *under* dialectics, that dialectics as invention (*Topica*) is on the same plane with dialectics as the art of judgment (*Logic*). The *Logic* is found on pp. 513-640, the *Topica* on pp. 641-752, of the same work on dialectics. This is a fundamental fact. It is not uncommon for writers on Melanchthon to say that after about 1527 he came more and more under the influence of Aristotle. Peter Petersen even thought that Melanchthon's use of the term *loci* goes back to Aristotle.²⁶ It is, however, Cicero's *loci* that he uses. Here is his definition: "a dialectical *locus* is a *sedes argumenti*, or rather, an index pointing out where is the source whence the material is to be drawn by which a proposition in question is to be confirmed; so that, if you should seek confirmation of this proposition: Glory is to be sought, some source is to be pointed out whence the confirmation is to be drawn."²⁷ This is thoroughly Ciceronian. It is not the "point of view" which Aristotle intended the *locus* to mean. But especially un-Aristotelian is equating logic with *topica* and both under dialectics.

It must be allowed, of course, that Melanchthon became friendly to Aristotle, thereby disowning the disavowal of him in his early Wittenberg days. One ought to be grateful for this, for it did at least keep Aristotle in the curriculum. It is questionable, however, if Melanchthon ever truly understood the Stagirite. As late as 1558 he still speaks of Aristotle's style as

26 Peter Petersen, "Aristotelisches in der Theologie Melanchthons," *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik* (Leipzig, 1927), Band 164, pp. 149-158. See also Bodo Sartorius von Waltershausen, "Melanchthon und das spekulative Denken," *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* (Halle a. Saale, 1927), Heft 4, pp. 644-678; H. Maier, "Philipp Melanchthon als Philosoph," *An der Grenze der Philosophie* (Tübingen, 1909).

27 *C. R.*, XIII, 659.

a "gold-bearing river," and charges scholastics like Thomas Aquinas with failing to deal justly with him because of a want of liberal training (i. e. training in eloquence and the arts belonging to it).²⁸ Hartfelder tells a story in which Melanchthon remarked to Stadianus that the *Analytics* really belonged to rhetoric.²⁹ He never got far from that student opinion of his. Petersen has shown, I believe, that Aristotle's psychology affected Melanchthon's reflections on the will and also on the idea of faith. But Petersen has less ground for thinking that the question in the *Erotemata Dialectices* on "What is God?"³⁰ is put in the spirit of Aristotle; for Melanchthon does little more than recite a sonorous list of divine attributes, with never a moment of contemplation on being as being.

Nevertheless, before he comes to his exposition of the *loci* as such in the *Erotemata*, Melanchthon goes to considerable lengths to show that he believes there are philosophical certainties.³¹ He denounces the Academics explicitly, and praises Aristotle as the philosopher *par excellence* because of his logic. He elaborates three grounds of certainty: experience (e. g., fire is hot); first principles (e. g., the whole is greater than any of its parts); logic (i. e., by means of a rightly constructed syllogism). Now is not that Aristotle in spirit? Melanchthon in fact distinguishes between propositions which are probably true and those which are certainly true. That is certainly Aristotelian.

It may be said first that this is not too surprising, for there is an affinity between believing that there is a body of knowledge, absolutely true, revealed from heaven, and the Aristotelian belief that there is knowledge which we may hold as certain. In this Melanchthon held with some very great churchmen from St. Augustine to St. Thomas. He frequently points out that men knew by the light of nature such moral laws as "Thou shalt not kill," before Moses revealed it. As long as there is a belief in Scripture as revelation, there will be a decent respect for Aristotle somewhere.

28 Letter to Pico (1558), *C. E.*, IX, 687-703. Pico's letter to Barbaro (1485) is in *C. E.* IX, 678-687. In Barbaro's reply to Pico, Aristotle is praised along with Plato as a master of rhetorical style. This letter is in V. Branca, *Ermolao Barbaro: Epistolae, Orationes et Carmina*, I, 101-109.

29 K. Hartfelder, *Melanchthon*, 39. *C. E.*, XII, 20 tells the story in Melanchthon's oration on education in 1518.

30 *C. E.*, XIII, 530-531.

31 *Ibid.*, XIII, 647-658.

But secondly, it must be said that Melanchthon did not hold to certainty in natural knowledge on philosophical grounds. He repeats over and over that one must believe $2 \times 4 = 8$ as certain *because* God wills that some things be considered certain and immovable.³² In another paper I have shown that he pursues the liberal arts because of obedience to God.³³ No doubt Melanchthon loved the arts, but he has not succeeded in finding a religious ground for their defense other than a legal one. The root of it lay in his heartfelt acceptance of Luther's formula of salvation as "justification by faith alone and not by works of the law." Everything outside of faith alone, therefore, has no connection with salvation. To pursue the good and true and beautiful, therefore, cannot in any sense be as important as going to heaven. It has no status in the order of things saved. Therefore they have a secondary significance, and they are preserved only by obedience. There is no rational justification for them on the plane of being.

III

The following conclusions may be made:

First, Melanchthon's works on theology are fundamentally rhetorical, or homiletical. They are handbooks for preachers. Their rhetorical character fits their author. The more widely one reads in his writings the more one realizes that both by training and by predilection Melanchthon is a rhetorician. He fully agreed with Quintilian that the highest attainment of a man is to be an orator. He believed that nothing is sweeter to human nature than thought expressed clearly, agreeably, and persuasively. His theological *loci* are intended to show the preacher the veins of Scripture which can be fruitfully worked for the rebuke of sinners and consolation of believers. The *loci* are also shot through with warning, comfort, and practical admonition; while later editions get more dialectical, he seldom misses an opportunity to give an homiletical turn to an argument. This homiletical character marks other sixteenth century works on theology, notably Calvin's *Institutes*. Such works were eminently suitable to Protestantism, which did very

32 *Ibid.*, XIII, 657-658. His argument is against the New Academy: "Tradidit autem Deus Arithmeticam, Geometricam . . . ac vult harum doctrinarum firmam et immotam esse certitudinem."

33 "The Twofold-Truth Theory in Melanchthon," *Review of Religion* (January, 1945), 115-136.

much toward inaugurating one of the great eras of homiletical art. The pulpit tends to be the hallmark of Protestantism. It is more than accidental that Melanchthon took his topical method from Cicero, the greatest orator of Rome.

Secondly, the question arises whether the theological *loci* or topics constitute a true body of theological knowledge or whether they are a body of Melanchthonian opinions. That is, who or what determines the *loci*? Who or what determines that Scripture alone, and not the living church also, provide the subject matter of theology? Or, who or what determines that the basic topics (*supremi loci*) pointed out by Luther—namely, law and gospel, sin and grace³⁴—are indeed more fundamental than St. Thomas' *locus* of God as Being, or than Calvin's of the glory of God? And who or what determines that natural reason does not play an indispensable role in theology? Surely, Melanchthon's theology is in the state of opinions very largely. There issues from it too little that savors of the authority that derives from knowledge. If theology is not a science, it does not matter, of course. But if it is a science, Aristotle had been a better master than Cicero.

Thirdly, as said above, we ought to be grateful that Melanchthon preserved Aristotle at all for theology and general studies. Aristotle's sixteenth century critics were many and various. Ramus held him to have written nothing true. Nizolius denounced him for obscurity. Numbers of scholars knew well only parts of him, e. g., the *Poetics*. Among his defenders stood Melanchthon whose reputation as arbiter of learning nearly rivalled that of Erasmus in letters. As the "preceptor of Germany" he put Aristotle in the curricula of the schools—a vastly important fact. It is also true, of course, that he so favored Aristotle because he considered him the ace of dialecticians and a rhetorician, in fact something of a "Ciceronian." Had he not so looked upon him, I doubt if he

34 Melanchthon caught Luther's predilection for St. Paul, particularly for the letter to the Romans. The main topics of it were seen to be law and gospel, sin and grace. Thus the soteriological element puts every other interest in a subordinate place. *C.R.*, XXI, 3-59, contains two of Melanchthon's writings (which he did not publish) prior to the *Loci Communes* of 1521. They bear the title of "Adumbrationes locorum theologicorum." The first is "Incubrationeula" (3-49); the second, "Theologica institutio in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos" (50-59). They clearly foreshadow the *Loci Communes* in that they are essays on the Roman epistle and identify as the *supremi loci* law and gospel, sin and grace. For all Melanchthon's later interest in other *loci* (Unity of God, Trinity, etc.), these four are considered throughout his life as the basic ones.

would have defended him. But just as sometimes a pagan classic was saved under the veil of allegory, so Aristotle was, in the present case, saved under the veil of eloquence and the arts that belong to it. Once in theology, Aristotle may give forth, to a generation that knows him better, things that may alter the Melanchthonian concept of theology. It may have its uses that Melanchthon had not too carefully examined his Trojan horse.³⁵

35 A word should be said in defense of Melanchthon's loci as a method of research. He makes much of this. It is especially prominent in his letter to Pico (cf. note 28). It is indeed a fruitful method, just as it is fruitful to look at history by considering the *loci* of centuries, biography, etc. But while the topical method leads to increase of learning, it cannot by itself give a clue to a true *summa*; neither can it, by itself, lead to understanding.

THE WILL AND THE UNDERSTANDING IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF JONATHAN EDWARDS

H. G. TOWNSEND

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

A new examination of this well worn theme seems to be appropriate in view of the current discussion of the place of metaphysics in the study of philosophy. The familiar supposition that philosophy may, and indeed should, dispense with all high speculations concerning the nature of "the grand scheme of things entire" while it devotes its time to "the order and connection of ideas in the mind," or to that quasi-mental order known as scientific methodology, would make of philosophy either a segment of natural science or a footless and irresponsible expression of animal hungers and party causes. Any philosophy, so we are told, which indulges in metaphysics is a mere rationalization of animal "drives" on a par with folklore, religion, and magic. Aside from the suspicion that this supposition is itself a metaphysical hypothesis not subject to scientific verification, the reasonable manner of dealing with it is to test it by comparison with rival suppositions in the history of man.

The eighteenth century is one of the most promising fields of study for such a comparison. It resounds with many of the very phrases taken over with slight modifications by contemporary logical positivism. The age of reason was no less the age of skepticism. The despair of human knowledge is the dark underside of that romantic brightness, that apotheosis of the will, that transcendental exaltation of man as creator of the world, which intoxicates with power and disparages patience and humility.

Jonathan Edwards lived in New England during the first half of the eighteenth century. The Puritan philosophy of life was his native grain, but that native character was early modified by study of Locke and Newton. He died before Kant came into expression and without the benefit of first hand acquaintance with Hume. His mind worked, however, with the same elements and problems known to Hume and Kant. Edwards'

debt to Puritan ways of thinking is, of course, overwhelming but his stature as a philosopher is to be measured by his place in the development from Locke to Kant. The Puritan literature of the seventeenth century has been explored by Perry Miller, in his book *The New England Mind*, more thoroughly than by any other in recent times. He has done it with competence and insight. He is aware that the solution of the problem of the will and the understanding offered by the Puritans of that century is only one solution in the long history of philosophy and that the problem remains, whatever we may think of the Puritan solution.

But it is not the purpose of this paper to explore the heritage of Edwards. It seems idle to suppose that the opinions of a philosopher can be dismissed as of no further interest when we have traced them to their sources. Such a study may accomplish much in establishing a frame of reference within which we are better able to understand the particular philosophy but it is not, and does not pretend to be, a study of the structure of that philosophy. The relation of the will and the understanding as found in Edwards deserves study in its own right.

It is well known that William James credited Edwards with one of the first studies of the psychology of religion. But it is seldom remembered that *The Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* (1746), to which James alluded, came at the end of a long study of the phenomena of religious experience. In the preface to that work Edwards declares that "the consideration of these things has long engaged me to attend to this matter with the utmost diligence and care and all the exactness of search and inquiry of which I have been capable" (p. 1). If we follow the clue, we are led certainly to the notes which he made on his own early religious experience. In the first biography of Edwards, by his friend Samuel Hopkins (1765), we have "a brief account . . . which," says Hopkins, "was found among his papers in his own handwriting: and which, it seems, was wrote near twenty years after, for his own private advantage" (p. 23). Quoting from this paper as given by Hopkins, we read: "I had a variety of concerns and exercises about my soul from my childhood; but had two more remarkable seasons of awakening, before I met with that change, by which I was brought to those new dispositions, and that new sense of things, that I have since had. The first time was when

I was a boy, some years before I went to college, at a time of remarkable awakening in my father's congregation . . . I experienced I know not what kind of delight in religion. . . . My affections seemed to be lively and easily moved and I seemed to be in my element, when engaged in religious duties. And I am ready to think, many are deceived with such affections, and such a kind of delight, as I then had in religion, and mistake it for grace." He then relates how this first delight in religion waned and not until "towards the latter part of my time of being at college" "it pleased God to seize me with a pleurisy; in which he brought me nigh to the grave and shook me over the pit of Hell" (p. 24). This period of his experience, he says, was marked by violent inward struggles, "but without that kind of affection and delight, that I had formerly experienced. My concern now wrought more by inward struggles and conflicts and self-reflections. I made seeking my salvation the main business of my life. But yet it seems to me I fought after a miserable manner: which has made me sometimes since to question, whether ever it issued in that which was saving; being ready to doubt whether such miserable seeking was [*sic*] ever succeeded" (p. 24). He makes it quite plain that his inner struggles were resolved when he became reconciled to the doctrine of God's absolute sovereignty: "But [I] never could give an account, how, or by what means, nor in the least imagining, in the time of it, nor a long time after, that there was any extraordinary influence of God's spirit in it: but only that now I saw further, and my reason apprehended the justice and reasonableness of it" (p. 24). Edwards then introduces the third stage of his religious development with these words: "But I have often times since that first conviction, had quite another kind of sense of God's sovereignty, than I had then. I have often since, not only had a conviction, but a *delightful* conviction." "The first that I remember that ever I found any thing of that sort of inward, sweet delight in God and divine things, that I have lived much in since, was on reading those words, 1 Tim. 1:17. 'Now unto the king eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever, Amen'. As I read the words, there came into my soul, and was as it were diffused through it, a sense of the glory of the divine being, a new sense, quite different from any thing I ever experienced before." He goes

on to say that he had a talk with his father "of some things that had passed in my mind" and afterwards he walked alone in his father's pasture for contemplation; "and as I was walking there, and looked upon the sky and clouds; there came into my mind, a sweet sense of the glorious majesty and grace of God, that I know not how to express. I seemed to see them both in sweet conjunction: majesty and meekness joined together: it was a sweet and gentle and holy majesty; and also a majestic meekness; and awful sweetness; a high, and great, and holy gentleness" (p. 26).

This is a brief account drawn from his own words of the three stages of his religious experience. We are to remember that the words were written probably as late as 1739-40. They are the words of a mature theologian describing in retrospect the growth of his religious experience. What is more, they were written in the midst of a theological controversy raging throughout the colonies and reverberating from lands across the sea. Some five years earlier there had appeared in Northampton a spectacular revival of religion and Edwards had been at the very center of it. In 1737 he had published *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in the Conversion of many Hundred Souls in Northampton and the Neighboring Towns and Villages*. This was followed in 1742 by *Some Thoughts Concerning the Present Revival of Religion in New England*; and finally in 1746, by *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections*. The modern reader, in comparing these three works, may be struck by a marked difference in the tone of them. The first is exultant, the second defensive though critical, and the third is reasoned and systematic. During this decade, Edwards had explored the phenomena of religious experience and had established the main outlines of what was to become a standard field of study.

The *Narrative* is a lucid description of the circumstances and the phenomena of the revival. The author takes note of the objections raised by outsiders and guards against the all or none fallacy by extended acknowledgement of excesses, but begs his reader not to judge the whole by the exception. He is confident that the revival had overwhelmingly good results and that the evils were such as must be expected considering the facts of human nature.

In the *Thoughts*, Edwards is much more on the defensive.

Seven years had elapsed since the beginning of the great revival and the evils of it were beginning to appear more monstrous as the months passed. There is a note of chagrin and grief as Edwards discusses the popular confusion between the genuine work of religion and the excesses of emotionalism and "spiritual pride." He begs the reader to judge the movement by its individual and collective or social effects rather than by its "supposed" causes. He admonishes those in authority—ministers and magistrates—to help rather than hinder the good work and to look forward with zeal and confidence to the establishment of the principles of the reformation in America. America may be God's chosen land for the perfection of the saints and it would be a great pity if through man's blindness and stupidity the coming of the kingdom of righteousness should be delayed.

In the *Treatise*, Edwards shows a mastery of form and material which was to characterize his mature work. He had found his method: to set forth the essentials of the argument and then to marshall the data and the evidence. Being the man he was he would not refrain as yet to quote a text from the Bible as the starting point. I Peter 1:8 "Whom having not seen, ye love, in whom though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." On the third page he writes: "Hence the proposition or doctrine, that I would raise from these words is this, true religion, in great part, consists in holy affections" (V. 9). "Here it may be inquired, what the affections of the mind are?—I answer, the affections are no other than the more vigorous and sensible exercises of the inclination and will of the soul."

He then declares that there are two principal faculties of the soul—the understanding and the inclination. The one "discerns and judges of things"; the other, "that by which the soul is someway inclined with respect to the things it views or considers . . . either as liking or disliking, pleased or displeased, approving or rejecting."

This appears to be the first formulation in the writings of Edwards of a doctrine which is the very core of his mature philosophy. If it were stated in the language of our contemporary discussions it would be called the radical distinction between judgments of fact and judgments of value. Some writers in our time have contended that there are two kinds of propositions: those which make assertions about an objective order in

nature and those which express subjective feelings, resolutions, commands, and propaganda. They go on to argue that it is the first class only which deserves the name of science or knowledge and that the others are pseudo-propositions because they are not in any manner subject to scientific treatment or verification. This distinction in contemporary philosophy has produced problems identical or at least very similar to those which troubled the mind of Edwards. The similarity is disguised by a radically different vocabulary but to the analytical eye it is the same old question of the relation between the understanding and the will. This is a question as perennial as philosophy itself—as old as logic and as new as semantics.

Soon after the publication of his *Treatise Concerning Religious Affections*, Edwards was plunged more and more deeply into the controversy which led in 1750 to his dismissal as the minister of the church in Northampton and his settlement at Stockbridge as missionary to the Indians. His banishment to the frontier enabled him to turn directly to the philosophical issues which had been germinating in the dark soil of his Puritan mind since his first years of college when he had explored the mysteries of Locke and Newton. In 1754 he published the first fruits of this reflection in his famous work on the freedom of the will. He did not live to publish the kindred studies on *The End for which God Created the World* and the *Nature of True Virtue*. These were posthumously published in 1788 and are still neglected by casual students of the period. It is, however, only when these four major works are examined in their entirety and in relation to one another that we are able to see what Edwards really has to say about the relation between the understanding and the will—knowledge and faith—science and religion.

If a reader of the *Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* lays down his copy and turns at once to the *Freedom of Will* he must perceive that the subject matter of the two is one continuous doctrine. In the second of these Edwards is still exploring the difference between the understanding and the will. The first section of the first part is concerning the nature of the will. "The will," he observes, "is that by which the mind chooses anything." In the first few pages he acknowledges his general agreement with Locke. Men choose freely and their choice is their will. It is a mistake to say that the will chooses,

because that is to suppose that the will is an independent entity whereas all "choosing, refusing, approving, disapproving, liking, disliking, embracing, rejecting, determining, directing, commanding, forbidding, inclining or being averse, being pleased or displeased with" are the acts of men.

Men choose, indeed, and choose freely, but their choices are in the midst of a world which their choices did not make. Edwards does not follow Locke's philosophy the whole way. He had a far more tenacious hold upon the doctrine that once and for all there is a world of determinate character within which all our willings and understandings occur. While Edwards was still a student in Yale college, his notes on the "mind" furnish eloquent testimony of his early dissent from Locke. In No. 6 of those notes he quotes Locke's dictum that "Truth is the perception of the relations there are between ideas" and writes a paragraph in which he seems to agree entirely. But No. 10, perhaps written a few days afterward, expresses a dissent and tentatively prefers the definition of truth as "The agreement of our ideas with things as they are." Still later in No. 15 he wrote, "After all that has been said and done, the only adequate definition of truth is, the agreement of our ideas with existence. To explain what this existence is, is another thing. In abstract ideas, it is nothing but the ideas themselves; so their truth is their consistence with themselves. In things that are supposed to be without us, it is the determination and fixed mode of God's exciting ideas in us. So that truth, in these things, is an agreement of our ideas with that series in God. It is existence and that is all that we can say."

To the student of the history of philosophy it is evident that by the middle of the eighteenth century Edwards was face to face with the issue with which Kant was to grapple a generation later. Kant's famous solution yielded the doctrine that the categories of the understanding ("space, time and causality," to employ the abbreviation suggested by Schopenhauer) apply solely to the phenomenal world, above and beyond which lies the noumenal world of freedom. The effect of this in history was to lay the foundation of that separation between judgments of fact and judgments of value to which I have alluded above.

The solution offered by Edwards differs widely from that of Kant. Instead of "destroying reason to make way for faith," as Kant declared his intention to be, Edwards retains reason as

the foundation of faith. Instead of putting morality, religion, and freedom beyond the reach of the categories, he struggles with the idea of human freedom within a determinate order—a world order of which *it* is a part. This gives to his philosophy a realistic and objective temper hardly discoverable in the whole body of Kantian literature.

In section III of the *Freedom of Will* Edwards proceeds in a characteristic manner to define his terms. "Metaphysical or philosophical necessity," he says, "is nothing different from their certainty. I speak not now of the certainty of knowledge, but the certainty that is in things themselves, which is the foundation of the certainty of the knoweldge, or that wherein lies the ground of the infallibility of the proposition which affirms them." Philosophical necessity, he goes on, "is really nothing else than the full and fixed connection between the things signified by the subject and predicate of a proposition." He then distinguishes three subordinate types of philosophical necessity: (1) formal ("innumerable metaphysical and mathematical truths are necessary in themselves"); (2) factual "because the existence of that thing either now is or has been; and so has, as it were, made sure of existence"); (3) consequential ("all things which are future, or which will hereafter begin to be, . . . are necessary only in this last way." "And therefore this is the necessity which especially belongs to controversies about the acts of the will").

These are his fundamental postulates concerning the metaphysical reality or totality of being. With this as the background he takes up the discussion of the place of the human understanding and the will. They are both parts of the natural order and therefore entirely subject to its laws—although each in its own nature is a special case of order and an exhibition of natural law. The natural laws of the understanding are the laws of inference and the natural laws of the will are the laws of choice. Man is not only a part of nature but a specific part of nature and like all other particular or specific parts he exhibits the laws of his own being. It is natural to man to understand and to will, but in both these activities he is limited by the determinate nature of the totality. He can understand, though he cannot understand perfectly; he can choose, though he has no power to determine the consequences of his choice.

After the publication of *The Treatise Concerning Religious*

Affections, Edwards had some correspondence with a Mr. Gillespie in the *Quarterly Magazine* of Edinburgh in which, along with much wearisome detail, he urges that no good inheres in *believing* that one is in a "state of salvation" but only in being so; for, says he, "the real truth of a proposition is in the order of nature first, before its being believed to be true" (*Works*, V, 336). This note of realistic or naturalistic philosophy recurs again and again throughout the work of Edwards. He can never forget that our beliefs and opinions are at best finite approximations to truth and that they must never be taken as the very truth itself.

This persistent feature of his thought gets its most adequate expression in the two posthumous works—*The Nature of True Virtue* and *The End for which God Created the World*. In the first, he takes up the same theme which we have discovered in the *Religious Affections* and *Freedom of Will*, i. e., the distinction between the understanding and the will. In the first chapter he writes: "There is a beauty of understanding and speculation; there is something in the ideas and conceptions of great philosophers and statesmen, that may be called beautiful . . . But virtue is the beauty of those qualities and acts of the mind that are of a moral nature, i. e., such as are attended with desert or worthiness, of praise or blame. Things of this sort it is generally agreed, so far as I know, do not belong merely to speculation: but to the disposition and will, or (to use a general word I suppose commonly well understood) to the heart." "So that when it is inquired, What is the nature of true virtue? this is the same as to inquire what that is, which renders any habit, disposition, or exercise of the heart truly beautiful." He then develops his characteristic argument that true virtue is "that consent, propensity and union of heart to being in general, which is immediately exercised in a general good will." Anything less than universal benevolence he characterizes as having a derived or secondary beauty, because "it appears beautiful when considered only with regard to its connection with, and tendency to, some particular things within a limited, and as it were a private sphere." The meaning is plain—a devotion of the heart is truly virtuous and beautiful when it has as its object that which is prior to all our understandings and affections, namely, the ground of all things in God. When the affections have been purged of all private

objects and have come to rest in God, then and then alone is the mind filled wholly with joy. Beauty and goodness and pleasure are joined.

We do not know which of the posthumous works came first in the career of Edwards. They might have come together, for they are of a single pattern. The book the title of which is *A Dissertation concerning the End for which God Created the World* may be considered as an attribution to God of all the perfections which the truly virtuous heart must have as the supreme object of its desire. God could not have created the world for the sake of the creatures, says Edwards, since creatures are created prior to their good and are finite. Hence, God's chief end in the creation of the world must have been the delight and beauty and glory of his own being. "For it is fit," he says, "that the regard of the creator, should be proportioned to the worthiness of objects, as well as the regard of creatures" (III, 16). The world is an emanation of God's being and the soul can find no rest until it returns to God through that all consuming benevolence to "being in general" which purges it of selfishness and finitude.

All philosophies are, I suppose, generalizations drawn from personal experience. Edwards has told us that when he was still a youth he was convinced by the speculative understanding of the being and sovereignty of God, but that he was not reconciled to it. The reconciliation came to him only when his affections were involved and he began to have a delight and joy which the understanding could not give. This came to him as a sense of the beauty and majesty of God and of the world which God had created. His earliest and perhaps his best generalization of this experience is found in his sermon on the Divine and supernatural light. There he declares that "there is a difference between having an opinion that God is holy and gracious, and having a sense of the loveliness and beauty of that holiness and grace. There is a difference between having a rational judgment that honey is sweet and having a sense of its sweetness." It is the sense of delight and joy added to the demonstrations of the understanding which distinguishes religion from philosophy. But he is careful to point out that the will without the understanding is empty. Edwards saw quite clearly that there is a difference between propositions formulated by the understanding and strictly subject to logical

processes for verification and inference on the one hand; and those willed choices which express our likes and dislikes on the other. From the latter issue all the forms of action which give men their moral and religious characters. What we like, prefer, incline to, and will is what we are and what we will be; our eventual destiny, no less than our temporal fortune, depends upon the will. Yet there is no salvation in the empty form of the will. To Kant's dictum that nothing is good except the good will Edwards would have replied that the good does not inhere in the finite choice but in the object of that choice. The good is that which in the wisdom of God is worthy of choice. Man is not saved by his choices but only by the rightness of his choices. If he choose the wrong thing; if he love evil and incline to folly; then of course he is not in the path of salvation. Our lives are fraught with hazard and uncertainty because we are finite in knowledge and power: but they are wrought in certainty by the infinite knowledge and power of God.

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN QUEEN ELIZABETH AND ROMAN CATHOLICISM

HENRY M. SHIRES
Alameda, California

During the reign of Mary Tudor, Queen of England from 1553 to 1558, Roman Catholicism became the official religion of the English state; and the English Crown once again recognized the authority of the pope. English Roman Catholics were jubilant while the Protestants believed that all of the gains of the English Reformation had been lost. The religious and even the political future of England was therefore clearly in the hands of Queen Elizabeth when she ascended the throne in 1558. She was subjected to strong pressure from both the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, and for some years the ultimate issue was in doubt. The religious decisions which were made in England during this period were, however, vital for the cause of Protestantism and of extreme significance for Roman Catholicism. Much of the historical writing which describes these crucial events is, naturally enough, the product of Protestant or Roman Catholic apologetic; and the subject is one which has need of calm and reasoned study as well as of ordered presentation.

Queen Elizabeth had attended the Roman Catholic Mass during the reign of Mary and in the first few weeks after her own accession to the throne. In spite of the fact that she had been born in 1533, four years after the opening of the Reformation Parliament, she did not pretend to be a Protestant but spoke of herself as one of the "Catholic potentates." She was distressed in 1561 when the pope classed her among the Protestant sovereigns. It is reported that she "believed that God was in the sacrament of the Eucharist and only dissented from three or four things in the Mass." In her own chapel she made use of a crucifix and altar lights. She was always opposed to marriage for the clergy. She undoubtedly possessed some reverence for antiquity and beauty in worship, and she has been described as "a Protestant with a taste for ornaments and incense." J. W. C. Wand declares that the state of her

own religious views is undiscoverable.¹ It must also be added that Elizabeth seemed to be untouched by the spiritual realities of religion. She did not possess her father's taste for theology, and she displayed a complete lack of interest in the higher questions of the Christian tradition. According to H. M. Gwatkin, "Nor did she ever show signs of personal religion."² It is evident that she was not much concerned with spiritual matters and that religion held a subordinate place in her thinking. Whatever her religious convictions were, they were of such a nature that they could without difficulty be transcended by other considerations.

Elizabeth was fully aware of the fact that England was religiously divided and of the possibility that England might be engulfed in a religious war at any time during the initial months of her reign. In most matters she followed the principle of expediency and avoided any extremes by pursuing a "middle-of-the-road" course. Even though they were alienated by the atrocities of "Bloody" Mary, a large minority, if not a majority, of the population were attached to the forms of the old faith. Moreover, the great danger which Elizabeth had to fear was an alliance between Spain and the pope against her; and she was reluctant to do anything in England which might incur the hostility of the Roman Catholic government of Spain. The success of her policy in this regard is a testimony to her high gifts of statecraft as well as to the negative character of her personal religious beliefs. Throughout her reign she seems to have been guided much more by politics than by creed. At least in her early years as Queen she had much more of good fortune and dexterity than of moral enthusiasm. As the daughter of Anne Boleyn, Elizabeth was officially regarded by Roman Catholicism as illegitimate, and the next in line for the English throne was Mary, Queen of Scots, a devout Romanist.

For many reasons the ecclesiastical policy of Elizabeth was designed to produce a state of equilibrium. The resulting Elizabethan religion appeared as part and parcel of a general amelioration. She refused to embark upon any rash course of Church policy; and she was unwilling to act as the head of what she once described as the "Protestant interest." J. H. Blunt writes that "In all the proceedings of the first four

1 J. W. C. Wand, *A History of the Modern Church*, 79.

2 H. M. Gwatkin, *Church and State in England to the Death of Queen Anne*, 218.

years of Elizabeth's reign care was taken to avoid all forms of expression which might cause unnecessary offence to the pope, and the papal party."³ Upon her accession, Elizabeth made no real change in the ecclesiastical practice which had prevailed under Mary Tudor, and except for an order that parts of the Communion should be in the English language and the Communion should be in both kinds, she waited for parliamentary action. The first meeting of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1559 was in control of the Roman party in the Lower House which immediately proceeded to pass a statement regarding five articles of doctrine. The fourth article held "That to Peter the Apostle, and his lawful successors in the Apostolic See, as Christ's vicars, is given the supreme power of feeding and ruling the Church of Christ militant, and confirming the brethren." This was the last attempt made by the official representatives of the clergy of the Church of England to restore Ultramontanism. Parliament passed into law in 1559 the Act of Supremacy, whereby Elizabeth became the Supreme Governor of the Church of England, and the Act of Uniformity, which gave authority to the Elizabethan Prayer Book, from whose Litany was omitted the petition found in the earlier Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552: "From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, good Lord deliver us." Furthermore, the ecclesiastical legislation of Henry VIII and Edward VI, which formed the legal basis for the English Reformation, was ordered restored; and all subsequent ecclesiastical changes had parliamentary sanction. By the Act of Supremacy of 1559, the exercise of papal authority in England or the acceptance of it was again made illegal. All beneficed ecclesiastics and all laymen holding office under the Crown were required to take an oath renouncing the spiritual as well as the temporal jurisdiction of every foreign prince or prelate. Out of more than 9,000 clergy in the Church of England at the time less than 200, the majority of whom were dignitaries, refused to take the oath of Supremacy and accept the new Prayer Book and so were deprived of their offices. In 1562 the oath of Supremacy was extended to all who had ever taken Holy Orders or a degree at the universities or who had been admitted to the practice of law. However, refusal of the oath of Supremacy was not judged to be treason, as it

3 J. H. Blunt, *The Reformation of the Church of England*, II, 355.

had been under Henry VIII; and at first the only penalty assessed was deprivation from office. The Marian bishops were imprisoned by 1560; but they were treated with great leniency and were set free whenever age, sickness, and the like gave possible excuse for the release.

In the early years of Elizabeth's rule it was imperative to minimize all potential causes of discontent, and by 1562 the state religion was beginning to capture the central nucleus of the nation. It is probable that for some time Elizabeth had entertained hopes of uniting all her subjects in one Church. In spite of the fact that Elizabeth was surrounded by many advisers who were Protestants, she favored the utmost latitude of belief and variety of ritual within limits. Likewise, A. D. Innes informs us that the bulk of the population was quite content with conformity to a compromise and was tolerant of a very considerable theoretical disagreement and even of actual non-conformity so long as it was not actively aggressive.⁴

Spanish influences kept Pope Paul IV technically friendly to Elizabeth in the early days of her reign, but she chose simply to ignore him. The conciliatory Pius IV was not long on the papal throne before he sent a courteous letter to Elizabeth on May 5, 1560, urging her return to the true Church. He wrote in part: "Wherefore, we do again and again exhort and admonish your highness that you would shew yourself obedient to our fatherly persuasion and wholesome councils." Elizabeth kept the pope's confidential agent and bearer of the letter, Vincentius Parpaglia, at Calais and refused to admit him to England. It was long believed that the pope offered to approve the new Prayer Book and to allow the reception of the Elements in both kinds on condition that Elizabeth would allow the Roman claims and receive the Prayer Book on the pope's authority. For this statement there is no direct documentary evidence; and the supposed offer is not mentioned before 1571, when Elizabeth herself made reference to it. It is perhaps significant that there were no Roman Catholic denials of the story until very much later, and it is safe to assume that in any case Parpaglia did have authority to go beyond his written instructions. The pope sent a second nuncio as far as Brussels in 1651, and it was in the same year that Elizabeth flatly refused the pope's invitation to send delegates to the reconvened

4 Arthur D. Innes, *England under the Tudors*, 2d ed., 290.

sessions of the Council of Trent. An authenticated letter to Lord Cecil from his agent Debenham in Italy states that "they (cardinals, archbishops, bishops and Jesuits) have thought fit, sounding out their inclinations how the common sort are taken with the Liturgy in English, for to offer her Grace to confirm it with some things altered therein, provided that her Grace and the Council do acknowledge the same from Rome and her Council."⁵ It is further noted that if these terms should not be accepted, indulgence and pardon would be granted to any one who might attack Elizabeth. From this time there is increasing bitterness on both sides; controversial literature begins to appear; English Roman Catholics set up a series of strongholds outside of England; and there are many signs of a growing hostility of the papacy to the English crown.

Nevertheless, for some years there is little evidence of a self-conscious Roman Catholic party in England. Although the acts of 1559 and 1562 placed the lives and property of the Romanists at the mercy of the government, there was no strict administration of the statutes before 1570. The Prayer Book was not condemned by the pope until that time, but he did declare that attendance of the Roman Catholics at the services of the Church of England was contrary to the Roman law. The English Roman Catholics were thus placed in a most difficult position. They were forced either to disobey the pope or to become recusants under the English law. Actually, there were few conscientious objectors to the Anglican services. J. H. Overton is authority for the statement that "during the first eleven years of Elizabeth's reign most Roman Catholics continued to communicate in the Church of England though Mass was celebrated privately in their own houses according to the old Latin rite."⁶

A new papal policy with regard to England was begun with the accession, in 1566, of Pius V, a fanatic and the nominee of the most rigid section of the Church. In 1563 a proposal for the excommunication and deposition of Elizabeth was sent to Trent from Louvain, where many Roman Catholic exiles from England were congregated. Moreover, Mary Stewart had sought refuge in England in 1568; and her presence was at least an occasion for the Northern Rebellion of 1569

⁵ Blunt, *The Reformation*, 435.

⁶ J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, I, 452.

which was aided by papal money but which was crushed in January of 1570. The pope took a long time to make up his mind with regard to Elizabeth, but it was becoming clear that the cause of the Romanists in England was increasingly hopeless. The earlier policy of restraint and hopefulness was abandoned. There was a hollow "trial" in Rome which condemned Elizabeth, the Prayer Book, and the oath of Supremacy. The pope adopted a policy of seeking Elizabeth's ruin by all means at his command as the only way of recovering his authority in England. In June, 1570, Pius V had published in England the Bull, "*Regnans in Excelsis*," which had been prepared a few months earlier and which excommunicated and deposed Elizabeth after she had reigned for nearly twelve years. Roman Catholics were forbidden to attend the services of the Church of England. It amounted to a declaration of open war against England because all of her subjects were released from allegiance to Elizabeth, and France and Spain were called upon to carry out the terms of the Bull. It is true that a papal dispensation in 1580 allowed Romanists "under the existing state of things" to take the Oath of Allegiance with a mental reservation, but the excommunication of Elizabeth was renewed by Pope Gregory XIII in 1583 and later by Sixtus V, and has never been revoked.

The Bull of 1570 is generally regarded as a political blunder of the greatest magnitude. It brought doubts, dissension, and dismay to the English Roman Catholics. Henceforth, they had to choose between loyalty to the Queen and loyalty to the pope. Many of them placed their political allegiance above the official proclamation of the papacy. According to Gwatkin, "the Bull practically wrecked the cause of Roman Catholicism in England."⁷ Henceforth, in the case of all Romanists in England, political and religious issues were inextricably joined. The pope had admitted that English Roman Catholics might profess loyalty to the Queen, but he had declared that they must assist in her overthrow if they were called upon to do so. Thus, all Romanists in England were made at least potential traitors. No way was left open to distinguish between treason and religion. The Puritan Parliament had displayed no anti-Roman animus until the issuance of the Bull; but the latter was looked upon as an insult to the English nation, and

⁷ Gwatkin, *Church and State*, 246.

it was followed by the passage of harsh measures against the Romanists. There could be no more hope of winning over the Roman minority, and all intercourse between England and Rome was now ended. Elizabeth was forced to consider seriously the threat to her life and her kingdom which the Bull had raised. Roman Catholicism in England began its existence as a persecuted separatist sect.

The pope was bitterly disappointed at the inefficacy of his Bull, and he determined to involve English Roman Catholics in political rebellion by stirring up active opposition to the government. He personally directed numerous political intrigues, and English Roman Catholics abroad shared his trust in a policy of violence. It should be remembered also that this was the period of the Counter-Reformation and of the aggressive Roman policy which is best exemplified in the Jesuit Order. In 1568 a seminary for the training of Roman Catholic priests to take the place of the older generation of Roman priests in England was founded at Douai by William Allen, who had been a fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and who remained the active head of the seminary until 1585. The first three graduates had arrived in England to begin their mission by 1574. By 1578 over fifty had been sent, and by 1580 the number was one hundred and ten. A similar institution had been founded at Rome in 1577, and two years later it came under the control of the Jesuits. The Jesuit invasion of England began in 1580 with the arrival of Robert Parsons and Edmund Campion, who had received their commission from Pope Gregory XIII, and who were determined to sow disloyalty as well as to gain converts. Parsons, a born intriguer, who probably sought the Queen's assassination, escaped to the Continent. Campion, a single-hearted missionary for his Church, was executed in 1581. The Jesuits and the graduates of Douai constituted an invading army. It has been accurately estimated that between 1575 and 1585, 250 Roman priests were sent into England; of these sixty were executed. Some of them were actively engaged in treason, and all were legally traitors. In some places they were deliberately unmolested by the authorities, but they travelled the country everywhere in various disguises. A letter from a Romanist to Philip of Spain confesses that "these priests go about disguised as laymen."⁸

8 Overton, *The Church in England*, 457.

Mary Stewart, who had been imprisoned in 1568 by Elizabeth, was the central figure in countless conspiracies against the Crown until she was finally put to death in 1587. Ridolfi was executed in 1572 after he had plotted the previous year to assassinate Elizabeth and to give the throne to Mary Stewart, as soon as she had married the Duke of Norfolk, so as to insure the restoration of Roman Catholicism. A definite papal campaign against Elizabeth matured in 1579 when plans were uncovered for the violent death of Elizabeth and for the stirring up of political revolt in Ireland and Scotland as well as in England. Plots against the life of the Queen, in which Romanists were implicated, became so numerous after 1583 that they are catalogued only with difficulty. The last important scheme was the Babington conspiracy in 1586. In 1588, Pope Sixtus V sent forth the Spanish Armada with his blessing and the hope that it would accomplish the long-threatened invasion of England which would depose Elizabeth. William Allen, a man of ability and of character, who thought that the restoration of England to papal control was the highest patriotism, had been made a Cardinal at the request of Philip II of Spain before the despatch of the Armada, so that when the conquest of England was accomplished he might reorganize the Church of England on a Roman basis. It was the last attempt of a foreign prince to conquer England for the pope. After 1588, the prospect of England's return to Roman obedience was only a fading ecclesiastical vision. English Roman Catholics were thoroughly divided as to the particular policy which should be followed; and they were composed of Marians, seminarists, Jesuits, Spaniards, and other parties. Nevertheless, the Jesuit, Robert Parsons, continued to urge Philip II through writings, sermons, and personal entreaty to renew the old schemes of invasion until the latter's death in 1598. After serving as rector of the English seminary in Rome, Parsons was appointed, in 1592, to be Prefect of the English Mission. In 1598 the Pope appointed George Blackwell to be archpriest with authority over the several hundred secular Roman clergy then in England and with liberty to organize the English Romanists for rebellion, if he desired to do so; but the day had passed when the pope could seriously dream of regaining ecclesiastical or political control over the English people.

To Elizabeth, Romanism was far more than a theology;

as the Bull of Excommunication had made clear, it was a system which involved vast public issues. After the first clean sweep of the episcopal bench and the first visitations, there was little religious persecution of any kind until 1570; but from that year the policy of the government toward the Roman Catholics became more severe, and that they were in every case punished not as heretics but as traitors may be seen in the fact that they were handed over to the civil power for hanging and not burning. Elizabeth was convinced that the only safeguard against the Roman peril lay in stringent coercive legislation, although she was reluctant to shed blood for the sake of religious opinion. The offences for which the Romanists suffered were political. Any man might have saved his life by denying the pope's power to depose Elizabeth. The foundation of the so-called Elizabethan persecutions was the principle that opinions as such were of no consequence but that those who would not conform their conduct to governmental regulations were either potential traitors or social anarchists; and potential anarchy or treason was regarded as implying the overt act. Wrong ideas were not in themselves a ground for persecution, and a full trial was given every accused person. Often two or three arrests were made before the offender was given serious punishment. The laws of the land were administered with varying degrees of severity, and many Romanists were imprisoned and released and imprisoned again in rapid succession. Elizabeth was hesitant about allowing any action which might bring on a war with Spain, and for a time she appeared submissive while the bulk of the population was eager for a war of religion. In the eyes of every Protestant the supreme danger to religion and to the kingdom lay in the possible death or deposition of Elizabeth and the elevation of Mary Stewart as Queen of England. There was also a gradual growth of militant Protestantism which was violently opposed to anything Roman and which began to make itself felt as a force in English political life. Elizabeth could no longer ignore the threat which Roman Catholicism raised to the established tradition of England for the English; and when once she had made up her mind, she held rigidly to her decision.

The publication of Elizabeth's excommunication was followed by no serious persecution, but England was placed on the defensive. Felton, who posted the papal Bull on the gate

of the palace of the Bishop of London and who was later placed on the Roman list of martyrs and beatified, was immediately executed. In the following year Parliament declared that any attempts to deprive the Queen of her throne or to introduce further papal bulls into England, would be punished as high treason. It would henceforth be treasonable to call the Queen a heretic, schismatic, or usurper. All who should become reconciled to the see of Rome would be judged as traitors. The first official recognition of the breach which the Bull had created was found in the opportunity which was given to all to return to the Church of England. It was in the same year that subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, a statement of reformed doctrine, was enforced upon all of the Anglican clergy. In 1577, nineteen years after Elizabeth's accession, the first of the seminary priests was executed. In 1581, after Parsons and Campion had begun the English Mission, Parliament passed the first of the Recusancy laws by which fines and imprisonment were to be the penalties for saying or hearing Mass, and fines of twenty pounds a month were to be levied on all who refused to attend the services of the Church of England. Merely to proselytize or to join the Church of Rome was judged to be treason. In 1584 a law was passed which called for the banishment of all priests who refused to take the Oath of Allegiance and their execution as traitors if they returned to England. In 1585 all Jesuits and seminary priests were ordered to leave England within forty days, if they would escape execution, and regulations were drawn up for Romanists studying abroad. In 1593 all "popish recusants" over sixteen years of age were required to stay within five miles of their place of abode and to attend the services of the Church of England on pain of forfeiture of property or banishment. The observance of the ceremonies of the Roman Church and the education of children of Romanist parents in Roman doctrine had become legal offences which involved property, liberty, and even life. For eighteen years Mary Stewart was in the power of Elizabeth, who deliberately abstained from seeking to prove that Mary was an accomplice in the various Roman plots against the English throne; and Elizabeth would not consent to Mary's execution until both she and the world generally were convinced of Mary's guilt. Finally, in 1587, Elizabeth was compelled by the weight of evidence to agree to

Mary's death, which had the effect of a gauntlet thrown down to the pope and Spain.

In order to track down suspected Romanists, Elizabeth made free use of spies and secret agents. She approved the employment of torture for the securing of information regarding Roman leaders and plans. Convicted offenders were occasionally hanged, drawn, and quartered. There was unquestionably some "witch hunting" and some campaigning against imagined plots. It has been carefully estimated that at the end of the reign of Elizabeth, 124 Roman clergy and sixty-three laity had been executed, while the number of those imprisoned cannot be determined. However, the total number of Romanists put to death during the forty-five years of Elizabeth's rule was considerably less than the number of martyrs in the four years of Mary Tudor's reign, and the Elizabethan persecutions cannot be compared with those of her predecessor. The violence of the anti-Roman campaign must be set in the light of the fact that death was at that time the normal penalty for such crimes as forgery and sheep-stealing. Moreover, there was in Elizabethan England a far larger degree of religious tolerance, in spite of the Roman designs against the Crown, than was to be found in any other state of Europe in the second half of the sixteenth century. No other regime then conceivable for England—Marian, French, Spanish, papal, or even Puritan—could have granted so much liberty of conscience. The Romanist "martyrs" gave their lives for the outworn medieval doctrine of the deposing power of the pope, although there was also some suffering for the cause of religion itself.

For several centuries Roman Catholicism in England was severely handicapped by its popular associations with national disloyalty, if not with treason. However, during the crisis of the Spanish Armada, English Romanists remained faithful to the Queen, contrary to Protestant expectations. According to Wakeman, "not one English Roman Catholic forgot the duties of patriotism in his zeal for the spread of his religion."⁹ Although Roman leaders abroad never withdrew from their original advocacy of a policy of violence, the political loyalty of Romanists in England continued to grow so that by the end of Elizabeth's reign perhaps a majority of them were opposed

9 C. Wakeman, *The Church and the Puritans*, 30.

to the forcible overthrow of the government. Roman Catholicism in England was at a relatively low ebb in 1603, but the attempt to check recusancy by legislation had not been very successful. Throughout Elizabeth's rule, English Romanists had shown an heroic obstinacy. The "martyrdoms" had produced a stimulating effect on Roman Catholicism, and English papists had found a new solidarity and zeal. Even though the cost had been high, a Roman Church was preserved in England. The English Mission to effect a new conversion of the English people, which was established under the leadership of the Jesuits and with the sanction of the pope, had been transformed into a permanent organization of the Roman sect. Today English Romanism has gained a complete emancipation.

The Elizabethan Church was far too much of a political and far too little of a purely religious institution, but the struggle with Roman Catholicism contributed to the growth of an intelligent loyalty to Anglicanism. The extremes of Romanism and Puritanism were rejected, and a *via media* was deliberately chosen. It was in this period that Anglicanism, attacked from without, first began to set forth its own philosophy and basic principles. In November, 1559, the scholarly Bishop John Jewel of Salisbury issued his "Challenge" at Paul's Cross, in which he declared that he would leave the English Church if it could be proved that any one of his fifteen selected points of Roman doctrine and practice was supported by the Christian Church of the first six centuries. In 1562 he went a step further in his *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, a direct defence of the English Church against Roman charges, which was composed in Latin so that it could be read abroad. Two years later it had been translated into English and was on its way to becoming a classic. Although it marked the beginning of a series of controversies, it was generally regarded as the official defence of the English Reformation; and it exerted a very strong influence on the English people. In terse and cogent terms Jewel maintained that the rejected Roman doctrines were contrary to Scripture and also to the teaching of the early Church as expressed by its authoritative councils and the consent of the Fathers, and he held that the changes made in the English Church were only such as were both necessary and consistent with the Catholic position. For a long time it was hoped that some Romanists might be reconciled to the Church of

England by emphasizing the Catholic side of her institutions and by checking the radical proposals of Puritanism.

Although the principle of toleration was very imperfectly understood by all parties, tolerance as a private attitude of mind became very prevalent; and extremists were thoroughly unpopular. Patriotism and national pride increased, and the public was inclined to be tolerant of all but the intolerant. The government allowed freedom of opinion, provided that there was an outward conformity to the Established Church, and thus a real step had been taken toward ultimate liberty of conscience. Innes sums up by saying that "the State sanctioned such institutions as under reasonable liberty of interpretation might be accepted without severe strain on the conscience of those holding opinions of considerable diversity so that conformity was possible to the great bulk of the nation."¹⁰

There can be no doubt that one of the outstanding features of the reign of Elizabeth was the ecclesiastical settlement. There was much that was capricious, vacillating, and unprincipled in her character and policy; but there was also much of real discernment and intuition. Even behind the legislation of Parliament we can trace her strong, guiding hand. She was a real nursing mother to the Church of England in one of its most difficult periods, and Wand adds that the "Elizabethan settlement was carried through with the assistance of men who knew what they were doing."¹¹ Elizabeth had saved England from the internecine religious strife which was prominent elsewhere in Europe at the time. The long association of English Romanism with political disloyalty was a strong influence in giving a decidedly Protestant tone to English thinking during subsequent centuries, and the only attempt made since to reunite the Roman see and the English throne cost James II his crown. It was Elizabeth, however, who must be given the credit for staking her own future and that of her country on an unconditional refusal to allow papal sovereignty in England.

¹⁰ Arthur D. Innes, *England under the Tudors*, 414.

¹¹ Wand, *Modern Church*, 89.

THE RELIGIOUS BACKGROUNDS OF INDONESIAN NATIONALISM

PAUL B. MEANS

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

Many forces, ancient and modern, European and Asiatic, political and economic, have combined to produce the present state of unrest and political turmoil in Indonesia, otherwise known as the Dutch East Indies. No one can fully understand the present situation with all its emotional tensions, unless he appreciates the various religious factors which are operative, to a greater or less degree, in the Indonesian nationalist movement.

This island world of Southeast Asia, where the Dutch have been the dominant power for over three hundred years, is no easy object of study. Covering a land and sea area larger than the United States and supporting a population of some seventy millions of people, intricately divided into numerous races, languages, religions, and types of culture, scattered throughout the one hundred thousand islands which comprise the Malaysian archipelago, this area presents a rich mosaic of the greatest scientific interest to the anthropologist, the ethnographer, the historian, the geographer and oceanographer, the colonial administrator, and the missionary statesman. Here the church historian and the student of missions will find some of the most interesting chapters in the history of the expansion of Protestant Christianity in Asia. Here some of the greatest successes in the history of Christian missions have been registered, and here has the largest indigenous Asiatic Protestant Christian community been developed. Here for many years will be one of the greatest opportunities of Christian missions to come to terms with the aggressive faith of Islam and here will probably be seen the richest developments of truly Asiatic civilizations, with a wide variety of racial and cultural patterns, in an Asiatic Renaissance largely caused by the impact of Western civilization and by the increasing appreciation of the values of the Christian faith.

In passing, one should pay tribute to Holland and her colonial administrators, who increasingly, during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, realized the nature of their task, and who by the arts of government, law, and education, in orderly and evolutionary steps, endeavored to prepare Indonesia for autonomy and self-government. The embarrassment which Holland feels today in trying to regain her pre-war position of influence in Indonesia may be regarded as one of the tragic consequences of World War II, both in its European and Asiatic phases. If Holland and the Netherlands Indies had not been the scene of violent invasion and consequent disorder and ruthless exploitation, on the part of both Germany and Japan, it seems likely that the promised peaceful evolution toward political autonomy would have taken place and Indonesia would be enjoying peaceful development rather than the violence and bloodshed which the present situation holds.

Five years of Nazi occupation left Holland paralyzed economically and industrially, with the result that she was too weak to assume her former role of leadership in the Indies, while the three and a half years of the Japanese control of Indonesia, which had been very skillfully prepared for and preceded by ten years of widespread underground political activity, especially among the Mohammedan peoples, left the Indonesian people ripe for widespread revolt and unrest. As a consequence, Holland finds herself in a very embarrassing position in the East Indies. In order for her to assume the role which Indonesia requires for its orderly and peaceful development toward autonomy and independence, she has to appear as the one Western power blocking the present revolutionary movements of the so-called Indonesian Republicans.

Indonesia's Religious Heritage

It would be impossible to describe all the religious influences which have helped to mould the character and outlook of the Indonesian peoples. Briefly, we may say that there have been five different religious traditions which have fused, or are in conflict today in Indonesian thought, namely, Animism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity. Albert C. De-Kruyt, in his masterly book *Het Animisme in den Indischen Archipel*, has shown how common and widespread are the animistic beliefs of the Indonesian peoples. In this respect, all

the various tribes and racial groups from the most primitive Papuan of New Guinea to the most highly developed pagan tribes of Celebes, Borneo, and Sumatra, and even including the Javanese and Malays who have become Mohammedan, accept as the background of all their thinking a rather primitive and pervasive animism. According to this belief, all nature, animate and inanimate, is the expression or manifestation of a supernatural force, variously called *mana*, *tondi*, *rua*, words which we might translate as vital force, magic, spirit. A stone with a peculiar shape or color may have a special vital force or *tondi* and hence may be used as an amulet for warding off evil or for increasing one's magic power. The arts of agriculture, of hunting, and of war, all depend upon the skill of the peasant, the hunter, or the warrior in building up through his implements, tools, and weapons by all manner of magic practices the inherent vital force or life-energy which ensures success and averts evil and failure. The whole pattern of tribal customs, and superstitions, even in such extreme expressions as in cannibalism and head-hunting, can be properly understood only as manifestations of this basic animistic belief. The reverence for *kramats* or graves, and even the religious dances and tribal ceremonies, again betray this basic animistic background. One might say that in general all the pagan and Mohammedan Indonesians have a universal belief and fear of evil spirits, and in various ways, by magical rites and superstitions, attempt to avoid or to control these forces of evil. Hence, the prominence in Indonesian life of the Pawang, Datoh, or Medicine man, the village wizard who by his magic, black or white, can control the tiger in the jungle, the crocodile in the river, and also the growth of the rice in the sawahs.

Vlekke, in his book *Story of the Dutch East Indies*, describes how this view determines the concept of the soul. "Every human being has of course its soul that attends the body throughout its lifetime and, after death, remains in the neighborhood of the place where the body is buried. The souls of the deceased continue to take an interest in the communal life and they may be angered if their descendants give up the old traditions or fail to fulfil their duties toward the spirits. In such a community old customs and traditions can not be easily discarded. Ancestor worship prevents innovations. The forces of nature were venerated by the ancient Indonesians and the

places where they worshipped remained unchanged throughout the centuries, even though new religions were introduced. The worship has been constant; only the gods have changed."¹ Even in the areas where Mohammedan doctrines are most firmly adhered to, one finds this basic animistic pattern under a thin veneer of Islamic theology.

The next great religious tradition which has profoundly influenced Indonesian culture has been that of Sanskrit Hindu India. Beginning about the first century of the Christian era, a wave of Hindu influence in the form of Aryan immigrants, merchants, traders, and teachers swept over the coast-lands of Sumatra and Java until eventually powerful Hindu kingdoms, such as Shrivijaya in Sumatra with Palembang as the capital, were set up and became the dominant influence in the main centers of Indonesian life. In time Java became a great center of Hindu learning and culture. Great temples for the worship of Siva, Vishnu, and Brahma were erected at Prambanan in Central Java. These magnificent temples, for so many centuries covered by jungle and left as a heap of ruins, were restored by the Dutch since 1910, and now stand as impressive monuments of the classical Hindu period in Javanese life.

During the eighth century a great Buddhist dynasty, the Shailendra, ruled in middle Java after a new wave of immigration, probably in the form of Buddhist monks and laymen, had spread over Indonesia and especially Java. The greatest monument of this period is the enormous stupa of Borobudur, one of the world's outstanding Buddhist monuments and one which compares in beauty and grandeur with Angkor Wat of Cambodia. It is clear from the many monuments which have survived that the kings of the Shailendra were great patrons of the arts. It was during this period that art and architecture, drama and music, were developed along the purest Indian lines. It is interesting to note that Hinduism and Buddhism, rather than conflicting in Java, seemed to merge and fuse in Javanese civilization. Although Hinduism was later superseded by Islam, and the last remnants of Hindu nobility were forced out of Java and found refuge in the island of Bali, the Hindu religion and art have left deep imprints upon Javanese civilization discernible even today. The great religious epics of Sanskrit

1 Vlekke, *Story of the Dutch East Indies*, 8.

literature, the *Mahabharata* and the *Ramayana*, have become as popular in Indonesia as in India and provide perennial themes for the classical Javanese drama, enacted in the well-known shadow puppet plays as well as in the *wayang wong*, the drama played at the royal courts by professional actors. Even in Moslem centers such as Solo and Jokjakarta, there is apparent a revival of interest in this classical Hindu heritage, reminding one of the Renaissance in Europe after the rediscovery of the ancient wisdom of Greece and Rome. Today in such a movement as the *Budi Utomo*, a popular movement for the revival of Javanese culture along purely Indonesian lines, one may detect this ancient Hindu religious treasure as one of the significant factors.

The fourth and greatest religious influence has been that of Islam. The story of the Islamization of the Netherlands Indies takes us back to the thirteenth century. About the year 1300, as we know from the writings of Marco Polo and from some Moslem inscriptions, the Malay archipelago was almost entirely non-Moslem. At that time there were only two small Moslem states on the northeast coast of Sumatra, which had developed from commercial relations with South India. During the next century this influence gradually increased and with the coming of the Arab and Persian traders in the fifteenth century the process of commercial penetration resulted in establishing expanding centers of Mohammedan influence. At first the religion of the Arabian prophet spread slowly, in the principal trading centers and along the coastal areas, but gradually these foreign traders became kings, largely through intermarriage with native royalty. Eventually Mohammedan states supplanted the old Hindu-Buddhist kingdoms of South Sumatra and Java, and Islam became the official religion. At first the new religion meant little for the masses of the people except a change in name of the Supreme Being from Siva or Buddha to Allah. Later, with the increasing infiltration of Mohammedan missionaries and the spread of the faith, either peacefully or by the sword, practically all the coast lands of the Malay peninsula and of the archipelago became solidly Mohammedan. The Malay peninsula, all of Sumatra except the central highland of Batakland, the whole of Java and Madura and the fringing coastlands of the other islands to the east were brought under the rule of sultanates and of the faith of

Islam. Only the island of Bali, to which the dispossessed ruling families of Java had fled, remained Hindu.

At the time of the arrival of the Portuguese in the sixteenth century the process of Islamization was still in its initial stages. The largest percentage of the population, especially in the interior and on the remoter islands to the east and to the north, were still animistic. These pagan tribes later became the object of fierce competition between the Christian and Mohammedan missionaries.

In introducing the arrival of the Portuguese in Indonesia, Vlekke, in his *Story of the Dutch East Indies*, says: "With them they brought another holy war, that of the Christians of Spain and Portugal against the Moors of Africa. The idea of the Crusades was always present in the mind of the Portuguese *conquistadores*. It influenced all their colonial activities. They started on their distant expeditions with the express intention of carrying the Crusades into the territory of the enemy."

With the coming of the Portuguese, who bitterly fought the Arabs for the control of the rich spice trade and who were rivals in commerce, politics, and religion, the work of Christian missions began. The conquest of Malacca in 1511 by the greatest of *conquistadores*, Alfonse de Albuquerque, opened a holy war in Indonesia between Moors and Crusaders.

By capturing or looting all Mohammedan vessels between Goa and Malacca and between Malacca and the Spice Islands, the Portuguese began the task of securing a monopoly of the spice trade with the Moluccas. At Ternate, Amboina, Halmahera, and other islands in the Moluccas Portuguese mission stations were established and thousands of the native people were converted to the Christian faith. It is true that the primary purpose of the Portuguese traders and officials was to realize the greatest profit from the lucrative trade in cloves, nutmeg, and sandal-wood. Illustrative of the evil reputation which they thus acquired was the opinion expressed by Saint Francis Xavier, the great Catholic pioneer missionary, when he visited the Moluccas in 1546: "Their knowledge is restricted to the conjugation of the verb *rapio* (to steal) in which they show an amazing capacity for inventing new tenses and participles."

Here in the Moluccas Islam and Christianity met head on in bitter conflict. Native sultans conflicted in authority with the

Portuguese governors and, as at Ternate, attacked Christian settlements and murdered priests while continuing to trade with the Portuguese officials. In 1570 the Portuguese governor, in despair between the demand from the royal treasury for profits and the demand by the missionaries for protection against the Mohammedans, had the sultan of Ternate treacherously murdered. This served only to aggravate the conflict, and the Portuguese were never able to restore their authority in the Moluccas. In this struggle between Crusader and Moslem, the Portuguese, by the end of the sixteenth century, had succeeded in weakening the power of all Indonesian coastal states except Atjeh in north Sumatra, but they had failed to stop Islam or to prevent its expansion. In central Java, at Mataram, a new and strong Mohammedan kingdom had been set up, and in West Java the sultanate of Bantam still remained fervently Islamic. The island of Bali continued as the last stronghold of the Hindu religion in the archipelago.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century the Dutch appeared on the scene and soon were able to drive the Portuguese from the islands. Without the support of the Portuguese, the Roman Catholic missions gradually collapsed. When the Dutch established themselves in Amboina in 1605, only a small remnant of the Catholic community was found. The Dutch, hereditary rivals of the Portuguese and the Spanish in Europe and in Asia, in politics, commerce, and religion, ordered all the Portuguese to leave the islands.

Now the era of Protestant missions began. For the care of the native Christian communities Dutch Protestant missionaries and chaplains were installed in place of the Catholic friars from Spain and Portugal. All further Catholic missionary work was forbidden. As one church historian expressed it: "The preacher replaced the priest, the sermon took the place of the mass and the Bible displaced the cross." Only the northeast half of Timor remained Portuguese and continued to be a base for further Catholic missionary effort.

In line with the prevailing conception of the relation of church and state, the Dutch government paid the salaries of the Dutch clergymen and sick-visitors, appointed them to their stations and regarded the care of the native Christians as a government enterprise. During the two centuries of rule of

the Dutch East India Company, whose primary motive was exploitation and profit, it was natural that the cause of missions should suffer grievously because of the complete dependence upon the state. When the Company failed the Mission failed. Although the Church in Holland did assist in the training and selection of clergymen for the Indies, on the whole the Church surrendered to the Company its responsibility for the progress of the Gospel. Through all the vicissitudes of four centuries of colonial history, changing from the Portuguese to the Dutch and from the Roman Catholic to the Calvinist creed, these Christian communities of the Moluccas have on the whole maintained their Christian faith down to the present day.

The great era of Protestant missions in the Indies was during the last century. The dawn of genuine missionary interest in Holland at the beginning of the nineteenth century was manifest in the establishment of the Netherlands Missionary Society and in the new sense of missionary responsibility which animated large sections of the Dutch Reformed Church. It is not our purpose to deal with the history of Protestant missions in the Netherlands Indies during this period. Suffice it to say that under the patronage of government support and control the Indian Church and the missionary societies of Holland, Germany, and Switzerland have made the Netherlands Indies one of the most successful fields of Christian Protestant missionary effort in Asia. Here in this island world the Christian community is a larger percentage of the total population than in any other area of Asia with the exception of the Philippines and Korea.

A recent religious census indicates not only the success of Christian missions but also the extent of the opposing forces. According to the 1930 census, the total native population of Indonesia numbered sixty million, of whom two-thirds lived on the island of Java and the small neighboring island of Madura. The Chinese, classified under the heading of foreign Orientals, numbered about one and a half million.

Of the native population one and a half million belonged to one or another branch of the Protestant Church. In addition, there were 340,000 Roman Catholic Christians. In other words, out of the total of sixty million, there were approximately two million Indonesian Christians. The Moslem population

was estimated at approximately fifty million, or five-sixths of the total. The remaining seven and a half million were of the pagan tribes, chiefly confined to the interior of Borneo, Sumatra, Celebes, and New Guinea and to a range of small islands, namely, Lombok, Soemba, Soembawa, Timor, and others. Since 1930, due to the great increase in population, these numbers have naturally increased. However, because of the missionary activity of Christianity and Islam the pagan tribes are being gradually won to one or the other of these two world faiths. The island of Bali still remains solidly Hindu.

The fields where Protestant missionary work has been most successful include the Moluccas, Celebes, and Sumatra. Here are found most striking examples of "group conversions" to Christianity. On the northern arm of Celebes almost the entire population is Christian, the Minahassa church numbering 245,000 members. The same is true in Amboina and in the other islands of the Moluccas where the church numbers 190,000.

Another successful piece of work has been among the Bataks in the central highlands of Sumatra, where the Rhenish mission of Barmen, Germany, worked from 1861 until the beginning of World War II. The first missionaries to these cannibal tribes of the Sumatra plateau were two Americans, Munson and Lyman, sent out by the American Board from Boston in 1833; one year later on their first exploratory journey to Batakland in the mountain jungles above Sibolga they were surrounded by Bataks, killed and eaten. Today there stands on that fateful spot a monument erected by the Batak Church to the memory of these Americans and bearing the famous inscription: "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church."

Today these Toba Bataks have not only been almost entirely Christianized but have become the evangelistic and missionary center of the Christian movement in Sumatra. The Batak Church has a constituency of approximately 450,000 with a normal increase of more than 20,000 annually.

These instances of wide-spread folk-evangelization emphasize the fact that it has been principally among the animistic peoples that Protestant missions have achieved their most significant results.

A much more difficult work has been among the Moham-medans. As every student of missions knows, the converts from Islam to Christianity in most fields are notoriously few. In Java, however, the Dutch missions have succeeded in winning 67,000 converts from Islam—probably the most successful piece of Christian work among Moslems in the world.

One of the striking indexes of the difference between the Christian and non-Christian communities is in the field of literacy. In 1930 the percentage of literacy for the whole of the Netherlands Indies was only 3.6 percent. In Java, Sumatra, and Borneo, the three principal islands, the percentage was 6.19 per cent. However, in the distinctly Christian area the percentage of literates was much higher: in Minahassa 45.7 per cent, in Amboina 39 per cent, and in Sanghi and Talaud 39 per cent. In Timor and Flores, where the Roman Catholic Church is stronger the literacy is only 15.68 for the men and 4.7 per cent for the women. In Tapanoeli of Batak land, where the Christian Church is strong, the literacy rate is 14 per cent for the men and 1.27 per cent for the women.

Another striking mark of the Christian community is the new position of dignity which is accorded to women. The longer Christian missions have been established and the more developed their educational program the more does the new dignity and equality accorded women become apparent. The Mohammedans often realize this deficiency and many who desire education for their daughters consent to send their girls to Christian mission schools. The pioneers in female education have always been the Christian missionary institutions.

The present confused political situation in Indonesia today is hardly intelligible without some understanding of the basic conflict and rivalry between Christianity and Islam in their various economic, political and religious phases. Dr. Hendrik Kraemer, outstanding scholar and missionary of Java, in 1935 sketched the nature of these conflicting religious forces as follows: "The islands are destined to become one of the most important meeting places of Christianity and Islam in the world. Christianity is not only making headway among the pagan tribes, but Java, which is entirely Moslem, offers, comparatively speaking, the spectacle of successful missionary work . . . Every year the number of Javanese Christians is increasing by

many hundreds . . . One may safely say of the central and eastern parts of Java that wherever well-planned missionary work is undertaken results will surely come. Only the north coast and the western part of Java may be considered as consciously and tenaciously Islamic. The rest of the country is still under the process of Islamization. The old Javanese heritage and the innate Javanese psychology make the people more open-minded towards spiritual forces of different origin than is usual in Moslem countries."²

The Indonesian Nationalist Movement

The religious traditions of Animism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity, which in varying degrees are operative today, supply the emotional undercurrents of the Indonesian Nationalist Movement. It is true that this nationalist movement is a complex of other factors and reveals a character similar to that of the neighboring countries of the Philippines, China, and India. In fact, these nationalist movements of the Orient may be regarded as one of the principal results of the impact of Western civilization upon the old Oriental cultures. They are in a sense revolts and counter-actions to that influence. Probably the greatest single factor in stimulating the nationalist movements of the Orient has been the influence of Christian missions and the widespread program of education along democratic and Western lines.

The distinctly Indonesian pattern of the present nationalist movement in the Indies is clear from the various forms of expression which this movement has assumed. Java, where Dutch political and cultural influence has been most intensely developed, has been the principal center of the nationalist consciousness. Java is the cultural and political heart of the Indonesian world. This island, about the size of Greece, contains almost two-thirds of the population of the Indies; it is here that the land has been most intensively cultivated and utilized. It was here that the new political and cultural consciousness first found organized expression.

One of the first indications of a growing national consciousness was in 1908 when Sudiro Husodo, a young Javanese doctor, inspired a group of young Javanese intellectuals to

2 H. Kraemer, *The Netherlands Indies*, 99.

organize an association called *Budi Utomo* (Noble Endeavor). The declared aim of *Budi Utomo* was to associate Javanese leaders together in a volunteer project for the educational and cultural emancipation of the Javanese people. Its program called for a "worthy national existence" by developing education, industry, science and art along new and indigenous lines. Although the aim of this association was avowedly cultural, it had political repercussions and awakened the Dutch people to the fact that new forces were at work. *Budi Utomo*, still a factor today represents, according to Doctor Kraemer, "a new form of Javanese nationalism, emotionally strong but in practical politics very moderate and of little influence."

The stirrings of Islam were evident in the formation of *Sarekat Islam* in 1912 when a group of native businessmen at Soerakarta banded together not only to protect native business interests against European and Chinese competition but also to strive after progress and to do this on the basis of Moslem brotherhood. By 1916 this party had developed into a powerful and somewhat radical political movement, with an active membership of 360,000. Its official program showed distinct leanings toward a synthesis of Islamic and Marxian ideology. However, its distinctly Moslem bias alienated the sympathies of many of the younger elements and thereby it failed to become the unifying and essential factor of Indonesian nationalism. The various stages in the development of this party reveal some of the dynamic factors at work—anti-Europeanism, Pan-Islam, and Communism.

In 1920 the Communist Party of Indonesia was organized and soon attracted a large following, especially among the coolie or laboring classes. A series of violent labor troubles and insurrectional outbreaks in 1926 and 1927 forced the Dutch government to drastic measures for the suppression of what many feared was developing into a violent revolutionary force. The principal leaders of the party were arrested and deported to the interior of New Guinea at Boven Digoel.

As offshoot and successor of the Communist Party a new party was organized in 1927, called *Partai Nasionalis Indonesia*. This was led by Mr. Soekarno, a young Javanese engineer, who at the present time is the Prime Minister of the Indonesian Republics. Mr. Soekarno, educated under Dutch auspices,

had studied in Europe and like Jawaharlal Nehru had absorbed a great deal of radical political and socialist theory. As leader of the Indonesian National Party, Mr. Soekarno soon became the hero of all nationalist-minded people of Java. As this movement became increasingly a threat to Dutch authority, Soekarno was arrested and deported in 1933. Thereafter, activities of the party were seriously curtailed.

The Sundanese, a people of some twelve millions who live in West Java and have never accepted Javanese dominance, have organized their own political movement, *Pasundan*. The object of this association was to exert political pressure upon the government to adopt a more liberal policy of emancipation and reform in the fields of education, economics, social, industrial and agricultural life. Here the basis of unity is nationalism of a much more particularist kind, namely, Sundanese.

Another group called *Persatuan Bangsa Indonesia* (Unity of the Indonesian People) and comprising in its membership all Indonesian nationalities such as Javanese, Madurese, Batak, Malay, Amboinese, and others, became the best organized, the most active and constructive party of all.

The present revolt against the Dutch offers the rather frightening prospect of introducing an era of bitter religious conflict and the possibility of a Holy War led by the fanatical Mohammedan groups against the minority groups who stand in the way of their absolute rule. Already thousands of Chinese have been massacred by fanatical Mohammedan groups and already many Indonesian Christians in areas where they are a minority have fallen victims to the Mohammedan sword. Mr. Hung Yuan Yuan, Chairman of the Netherlands East Indies Chinese Association, and spokesman for the 2,000,000 Chinese of Indonesia, recently declared that withdrawal of the Dutch forces from positions won in the present fighting would mean the massacre of thousands of Chinese by Indonesian nationalists. This Mohammedan threat poses a real danger to the Indian Church of these islands. The rising tide of the Pan-Islamic movement in Egypt, Palestine, Arabia, and India, and especially in the internecine feuds which have developed in the partition of India between Pakistan and Hindustan, is being

felt in Indonesia and may have violent repercussions there in the days ahead.

It is reasonable to assume that the fateful course of political development in Indonesia will in a measure depend upon the intelligent sympathy and understanding which the West and especially the Christian church outside of Indonesia show in the present crisis of Indonesian and European relations. The United States, through the United Nations, offered its good offices in trying to effect a truce and to mediate the points in dispute. One only wishes that the World Council of Churches might use its good offices through experts who know the religious situation and so serve the cause of peace by their appreciation of the human and spiritual values in both Indonesian and European sides of the conflict. Whatever the outcome of this present crisis may be it is certain that the future of the Christian movement in that area will be profoundly affected. At times of such revolutionary change there may be a distinct retrogression in what has been one of the most promising fields of the Christian missionary enterprise. In conclusion, we may say that Indonesia today stands at the fork of the road, and the course she now takes will be profoundly significant for the future of Christianity in Asia.

IN MEMORIAM

PLATO E. SHAW

Plato E. Shaw, professor of Early Church History at the Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., died August 4, 1947, at his home in New York City after a long illness. He was 64 years old.

Professor Shaw was born in Athens, Greece, and came to this country in 1916. After receiving his religious training in England, he spent ten years there as a minister in Wesleyan Circuit Methodist churches. He taught for two years at Wesley College, Grand Forks, N. D., before joining the Hartford faculty, becoming full professor in 1935. He received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Edinburgh in 1935. He retired from active teaching in 1941, on account of ill health. Professor Shaw was elected a fellow of the Royal Historical Society in London in 1921.

PETER GUILDAY

Peter Guilday was born of Irish parents at Chester, Pa., on March 25, 1884. He studied for the priesthood at St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Overbrook, Pa., and in 1907 won a scholarship to the American College in Louvain. Later he studied at Bonn and the University of Louvain where he received his doctorate in 1914. Later that year he became instructor in Church History in the Catholic University in Washington, D. C. In 1915 he founded *The Catholic Historical Review*. He was also the guiding spirit in the organization of the American Catholic Historical Association on December 30, 1919.

After five years as an instructor, Father Guilday was named to an associate professorship in 1919, and upon the publication of his *Life and Times of John Carroll* (New York, 1922) was promoted to a full professorship in 1923. In 1927 he published a two volume *Life and Times of John England*, probably his most important work. In 1924 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society and in 1935 was made a domestic prelate of his Church by Pope Pius XI.

Monsignor Guilday died on July 31, 1947.

Raymond W. Albright.

AMONG THE MEMBERS

EDITED BY WINTHROP S. HUDSON

MAURICE W. ARMSTRONG, professor of history at Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pennsylvania, has been appointed head of the department of history and political science in that institution. He is the author of two recent articles: "The First Protestant Ordination in Canada," in the April 1947 issue of *The Dalhousie Review*, and "Jonathan Scott's Brief View" in the April number of *The Harvard Theological Review*.

CATHERINE E. BOYD, assistant professor, The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, has been appointed associate professor of European History in Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota.

OSCAR G. DARLINGTON, professor of history and chairman of the department of history at Hofstra College, Hempstead, New York, has published an article, "Gerbert, the Teacher," in *The American Historical Review* (April, 1947), and was elected one of the two National Councillors of Phi Alpha Theta, National Honorary History Fraternity.

CARL SCHNEIDER, professor of Church History in Eden Theological Seminary, has resumed his teaching duties at Webster Groves, after a two-year leave of absence during which he served on the staff of the World Council of Churches in Geneva, Switzerland.

FELIX J. SCHRAG, formerly of the University of Toledo, is now head of the department of sociology, Franklin College, Franklin, Indiana.

JOHN C. WENGER, professor of Theology and Philosophy in the Goshen College Biblical Seminary, Goshen, Indiana, is the author of *Glimpses of Mennonite History and Doctrine*, published by the Herald Press, Scottdale, Pennsylvania.

HUGH J. NOLAN, professor in the St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., is editor of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* and the author of *Francis Patrick Kendrick, Bishop of Philadelphia, 1830-1851*. He has started an American Church history seminar, in which twenty students have undertaken dissertations, principally in the field of Minnesota Catholic history. Father Nolan, who holds a Ph.D. degree from the American Catholic University, was trained under the late Monsignor Guilday.

FRANK S. BREWER 1948 PRIZE

Under the bequest of Frank S. Brewer, the American Society of Church History awards a prize of \$500.00 toward the expense of publication of a winning essay, whenever the income of this fund permits.

The next contest will close on June 1, 1948. On or before this date essays offered in competition must be in the hands of the Secretary of the Society.

In order to be considered for this prize, the manuscripts must be in typed form, properly documented, and ready for submission to the printer.

Raymond W. Albright, *Secretary*,
1524 Palm Street,
Reading, Penna.

REPORT ON THE PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

The meeting to organize this branch was held in September, 1945, at Berkeley Baptist Divinity School. Its first officers were: President, Sandford Fleming; Vice-President, Quirinus Breen; Secretary-Treasurer, Henry M. Shires.

A second meeting was held in August, 1947. The business transacted is described in the minutes herewith incorporated:

Minutes of the Meeting of the
Pacific Coast Branch, the American Society of Church History,
Chapman Hall, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon
August 19 and 20, 1947

The regular business meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Society of Church History was opened at 4 P. M., August 19, by the President, Dr. Sandford Fleming. The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved. The following were nominated and declared elected as officers of the Branch for the coming year: President, Dr. Quirinus Breen; Vice-President, Dr. Clifford M. Drury; Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Henry M. Shires. It was voted that Dr. Breen should prepare a list of nominations for the Executive Committee to be presented at a late hour. The meeting was adjourned after a discussion of plans for a membership drive.

The final business session was held at 11:30 A. M. on August 20, with President Fleming again presiding. The following were nominated and declared elected as members of the Executive Committee: Dr. Sandford Fleming, Professor Frank J. Klingberg, the Rev. Arnold Crompton, Professor Charles Whiston. It was voted that the Branch record its appreciation of the contributions to the meeting made by Miss Betty Misner, Mrs. Turnipseed, Dean Eldon Johnson, Professor Paul B. Means and the Department of Religion, Dr. John T. McNeill, all those who presented papers, including the faculty members of the University, all who attended the sessions, Dr. Fleming, the retiring President, and Dr. Breen, who arranged the program.

Respectfully submitted,
Henry M. Shires, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

The following papers and addresses were given:

"Calvin's Institutes," "Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity," "Law's Serious Call" (3 papers), by John T. McNeill of the Union Theological Seminary.

"The Will and the Understanding in the Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards," by H. G. Townsend, Chairman, Department of Philosophy, University of Oregon.

"The Problems of Local Church Historians," by Dan E. Clark, Chairman, Department of History, University of Oregon.

"The Conflict between Queen Elizabeth and Roman Catholicism," by Henry M. Shires, Christ Episcopal Church, Alameda, Calif.

"John Dryden's Conversion to Rome," by Hoyt Trowbridge, Department of English, University of Oregon.

"The United Church of Canada," by Douglas H. Telfer, President, United Church of Canada, Conference of B. C.

"The Religious Background of Indonesian Nationalism," by Paul B. Means, Chairman, Department of Religion, University of Oregon.

"On the Use of *Loci Communes* and *Loci* in Melancthon," by Quirinus Breen, Department of History, University of Oregon.

"Prospects of Church History on the Pacific Coast," by Sandford Fleming, President, Berkeley Baptist Divinity School.

The conference was exceptionally well received by both faculty and students on the Oregon campus. Something of the breadth of church history was exemplified by the ready cooperation of scholars in diverse fields.

We of the Pacific Branch are gratified with the notice the parent society is taking of us. The Pacific Coast Number of *Church History* containing four of the papers read at the last meeting should stimulate considerable interest in the cause west of the Rockies. Professor McNeill's papers are being published in book form.

Two regional meetings are to be held. One meets in Berkeley (January 2, 1948), jointly with the Pacific Branch of the American Historical Association. Professors C. M. Drury and Q. Breen will read papers. The other will be held at the University of California, Los Angeles, in the spring. It will be under the direction of Professor Frank J. Klingberg and President Sandford Fleming.

Quirinus Breen, *President.*

BOOK REVIEWS

A HISTORY OF THE JEWS

By SOLOMON GRAYZEL. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 5707-1947. xxv-835 pages. \$3.50.

The sub-title, *from the Babylonian Exile to the end of World War II*, describes the chronological inclusiveness of this history. Five books, each subdivided into from eight to twelve chapters of readable length, recount the history presented as five major periods of Jewish life. Book One encompasses the Second Commonwealth, from the sixth century B.C. to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. The work of Ezra and Nehemiah, of the Maccabees, the careers of Herod and his successors, and the partisan conflicts of the Jewish people as they faced disaster, are described, together with a picture of the early teachers and their schools which made survival possible. In Book Two the events that made the Babylonian communities of Sura and Pumbeditha central in Jewish life, with the end of the old Palestinian ordination of rabbis, are related, with an account of the scholars and the environments that produced the two Talmuds. This narrative is brought up to the seventh century and the rise of Islam. Book Three tells the dramatic story of the rise, decline, and fall of Spanish Judaism, indeed, of Spanish civilization, together with the contemporary Jewish history of the wider medieval world, its literary activity, as in Egypt, and in Provence, the sordid tragedies of the Crusades, the Black Death, and the Ghetto. Book Four describes the regaining of freedom as the migrating Jews found themselves new homes, especially in Poland, Holland, England, and America. Finally, Book Five in somewhat greater detail brings the story from the Napoleonic Era to our own day, with the strangely contrasting freedoms and hatreds that have arisen in modern times.

Dr. Grayzel has a great gift in writing history. Well-known facts he reports without dullness. In what historians have always described as the Diaspora, because it is scattered over the known world, he not only finds the threads of connection, but clearly shows them to the reader. Adequate maps and illustrations, of which there are twenty-four and one hundred twenty-one, respectively, pleasantly add to the book's readability. As is appropriate in historical writing that surveys so wide a field, the interpretations offered are on the whole conventional; sound scholarship rather than novel hypotheses prevails. The choice of the Babylonian Exile as the beginning of the account is happy, for this is the birth of Judaism as we know it. More than one writer in surveying Jewish history, by beginning with the earlier Biblical stories, has brought disunity into his narrative and earned the disapproval of specialists in that more ancient period. The paths that lead to modern Zionism, or Jewish nationalism, are traced rather too clearly throughout the centuries: this, which seems to the pres-

ent reviewer a minor defect in interpretation, is no doubt the shadow cast on our times by other more blatant nationalisms.

This book is directed to the wider Jewish public, where it should have enthusiastic reception. The story that it tells, however, should also be known to every educated gentile; hardly can it be found in more attractive form than here.

The Hartford Theological Seminary.

Moses Bailey.

LE DOTTRINE POLITICHE DA LUTERO A SUAREZ

By GIUSEPPE SANTONASTASO. Verona: Biblioteca storica, 1946. 132 pages.

The author observes that Protestantism and Catholicism alike developed divergent political theories. Lutheranism, he thinks, issued in state absolutism and Calvinism pointed to democracy, whereas at the same time Catholicism developed in the direction of absolute theocracy in the hands of Bellarmine, but toward democracy with Mariana and Suarez. This point, however, interesting as it is, is not the main concern of the book, so much as the retention in the modern sovereign states of the concept of moral limitations upon absolutism and the development within the state of juridic equality.

The material chosen for study is almost entirely Continental. England and Scotland receive but passing notice, and the literature examined is chiefly Italian and French, to some extent German, quite occasionally English. The references to recent Italian literature are particularly useful.

The least satisfactory part of the book, to my mind, is the treatment of Luther, who is all too closely identified with subsequent Lutheranism. The unfortunate comparison by Troeltsch of Luther to Machiavelli is appropriated without reference to the corrective introduced in the studies of Carl Holl. As a matter of fact, Luther and Calvin were not so far apart as Lutheranism and Calvinism came to be. Luther did regard the emperor as a constitutional monarch subject to check, and he did recognize the legitimacy even of armed resistance to the emperor on the part of the lower magistrates in case of the violation of the constitution. The author himself notes that the *Magdeburg Bekenntnis* belongs in the line which runs to the *Monarchomachi*, but he does not point out that this was a Lutheran document.

The Anabaptists are rightly described as the true religious democrats of the sixteenth century, but the treatment of them is exceedingly scant. The differences between Calvin and Beza are glossed over. The restriction of "Protestant democratic thought" to the political thinkers of the French wars of religion without consideration of English Puritan thought gives decidedly an incomplete picture.

One finishes with a sense on the one hand of the complexity of the whole subject, but on the other hand with a feeling of continuity in the survival of the concept of the state as a moral organism.

Yale University.

Roland H. Bainton.

DEUTSCHE BEITRÄGE ZUR GEISTIGEN UEBERLIEFERUNG

Edited by ARNOLD BERGSTRÄSSER. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947. \$4.00.

It is extremely difficult as well as hazardous to attempt to review a symposium written by more than a dozen experts in highly specialized fields of research. Such divergent topics as "The Western Legacy of Liturgy," "Martin Luther's Faith," "Erasmus: Achievement and Challenge," "Martin Schongauer's Classical Style," "The Religious Faith of Young Lessing," "Peace in Goethe's Poetry," "Stein and the Reestablishment of Local Government," "Schiller and Posterity," "Remembering Hofmannsthal," "Ernst Wichert's Hirtennovelle," are discussed with profound insight and understanding. Needless to say that these are all part and parcel of our western culture, though many of its most ardent pundits know it not. A world of difference opens up between the first two essays, the one by Otto Georg von Simon on "The Western Legacy of Liturgy," the other by Wilhelm Pauck on "Martin Luther's Faith." Von Simon writes from a Catholic point of view, but he writes with considerable pathos and discernment. He points out that "among the great works of occidental poetry the liturgy of the Church is the only element which has disappeared from the life of our culture; it is perhaps also the only element in the history of literature which continues to exist while having ceased to function." Even within the Roman Catholic Church the ancient liturgy is no longer properly understood. Therefore it is one-sided, according to Simon, to attribute modern secularism exclusively to Protestantism. Post-tridentine Catholicism has made its contribution to this development. And this has led to the withering of liturgy in modern times. What is the meaning of liturgy? Simon answers: "Liturgy is a fugue about one single theme: death and resurrection. At its base lies that rhythm of '*Stirb und Werde*' which Goethe has interpreted as the condition of all true humaneness (*Menschlichkeit*). The '*Stirb und Werde*' of liturgy is the death and resurrection of Christ." An informed theologian, whether Protestant or Catholic, might, I aver, readily assent to the first part of von Simon's definition of liturgy. But is it proper even to compare Goethe's famous dictum concerning the "*Stirb und Werde*" with the "death and resurrection of Jesus Christ"? Again: Simon interprets liturgy as a form of poetry and not as doctrine. Is it not both? If, as our author avers, liturgy is neither a remembering nor biography, but dramatic representation of the death of the saints, how can doctrine be excluded?

Wilhelm Pauck renders American Christians a real service by his analysis of Luther's faith. The Reformer did not conceive of himself as a religious genius, but rather as God's unworthy prophet and evangelist. "One does not understand Luther if one leaves out of sight the duality of his sense of mission, his insistence to have been driven and borne up of God and his rejection of all personal worthiness." Consequently, it is presumptuous folly to attempt to interpret the Reformation merely in terms of human criteria. At least Luther himself did not so interpret the work he had been instrumental in launching. God's command and God's promise,

superbly and decisively revealed in Jesus Christ, were the motives of the Reformer's endeavour.

Rottfels' essay on Freiherr vom Stein is a rewarding study. It might be of profit to radicals of both left and right. Those who have tried to make Stein a pacemaker for Adolf Hitler will have to reexamine their conclusions.

This symposium is indicative of the vigour of thought among German refugee scholars. We are indebted to the friends of the Germanic department of the University of Chicago and its press for making this publication possible. Most of all, however, to these scholars who have written these provocative essays.

Colgate Rochester Divinity School.

William A. Mueller

THE PROPHETIC FAITH OF OUR FATHERS, III

By LEROY EDWIN FROMM. Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1946. 751 pages, bibliography and index.

This volume is a review of prophetic interpretation among American colonial theologians, and among European and American religionists, just prior to the appearance of Millerism in this country. Two preceding volumes and a succeeding one are to complete the study.

The prophetism here presented is not the politico-social prophetism which is the concern of current theological study, but rather apocalypticism. Indeed, the matter presented is limited to interpretations of the views contained in the Biblical books of Daniel and the Revelation, with some passing reference to the 24th chapter of Matthew. So restricted is the field covered, and so unique the vocabulary, that one should read carefully the books of Daniel and the Revelation in order not to be puzzled by the terminology of the volume.

That the author has convictions of his own on these matters appears from time to time in the text. He passes judgment upon John Cotton's "Augustinian Concept" of the first resurrection (pp. 39, 40). Whitby's system of interpretation is called "disruptive" (p. 145), and is said to "take its toll" (p. 168). Reference is made to the "prophetic truth on the identity of antichrist" (p. 164). Clarke is "confused on the (prophetic) periods" (p. 354). It is refreshing, however, to find a writer who will not hide his convictions on matters which for a century or better have elicited from theologians only a lifted eyebrow. Then, too, it is doubtful if anyone without the interest conviction brings would have dug so exhaustively into the mass of material, difficult to come at, which the book presents.

The results will be surprising to any who do not know that apocalyptic ideas saturated the thinking of theologians and laymen back of 1850. Says the author, "Prophecy, with prophetic study and interpretation, was inextricably woven into the very warp and woof of colonial thinking and expression. It molded the motives and objectives of these men, and controlled their conduct" (p. 23). The ignoring of this fact by current students of the period concerned is called (p. 25) "a serious omission."

More distinction could have been made between the apocalyptic which

produced a tendency toward political revolt, and the implications which were pacific. Doubtless this will be made clear in Vol. II, yet to appear.

The bibliography is very full. Something would have been gained in it, however, had strictly secondary books been listed separately. The index seems complete and usable. A number of useful charts and diagrams are included.

Besides opening up neglected by-paths in the history of theological study, the book shows clearly, though rather incidentally, what has not been sufficiently appraised: the revolutionary results of the impact of Roman Catholic theology on the one hand, and of "protestant rationalism" (pp. 655 and *passim*) on the other, upon theological thinking during the last 150 years. Already in Cotton Mather's day "the world had moved on from the positions of the previous generation" (p. 125), and in more ways than concerned "Puritan formalism." There is here, also, much material indicating the soil in which Irvingism and Millerism found their roots, as well as some phases of Fundamentalism.

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.

Frank H. Yost.

HISTORY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY OF AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS, 1690-1820

By CLARENCE S. BRIGHAM. Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1947, 2 vols., xvii, 1508 pages. \$15.00.

When, in 1937, the Bibliographical Society of America guided to press that imposing reference aid entitled *American Newspapers, 1821-1936: A Union List of Files Available in the United States and Canada*, the editors explained that recordings had not been made prior to 1821 because Dr. Clarence S. Brigham was conducting exhaustive journalistic research in this earlier field and would soon be publishing the results of his study in readily available form. The two volume publication under review is this promised work. The product of thirty-five years of painstaking bibliographical exploration, which required 10,000 miles of travel and correspondence amounting to 15,000 letters, it can scarcely be called less than monumental in the field of *Americana*.

For the historian these large octavo volumes have special significance. They open a vast, rich reservoir of source material as yet too little used in the writing of the story of nascent American life—the host of newspapers issued during the late colonial, revolutionary, and early national periods of our history. Fully 2,120 different American newspapers are listed as published through 1820. An historical account of each is provided. Library locations are recorded. A fine set of indexes is appended to facilitate quick discovery of specialized types of information.

The basic arrangement of materials is geographical, first by state, then by city. Every state east of the Mississippi River (including the District of Columbia) is represented except Wisconsin; and three states west of the river are represented as well—Louisiana, Missouri and Texas. Under the city of publication within the state a brief historical sketch of the particular paper is given, with exact dates of changes of title or name of

publisher (also of printer and editor if specified in the imprint). If exact data is lacking for any title it is because a working file of the paper is not available for consultation. Such instances are relatively rare. Only 190 of the 2,120 papers have escaped location in any form whatsoever. Another 190 have been located only in the form of unique issues in single libraries. Nearly all of the remainder have been located in form sufficiently complete to make them priceless historical treasures. Half the files are ninety per cent complete or more, a remarkable fact when one considers these papers commonly enjoyed life-spans of from five to eighty-seven years through 1830. Further the concentration of complete or nearly complete files is such as to make them easily accessible to the inquiring scholar. The American Antiquarian Society has 542 such files, the Library of Congress 365, the New York Historical Society 228, the New York Public Library 147, Harvard University 140, the Wisconsin Historical Society 122. Visitation of one or two of these major collections and the occasional stop en route to consult the odd holding of a smaller historical foundation will provide as full press information as most will care to gather on a particular subject.

The indexes which follow the protracted geographical section of the study (1175 pages) are of three sorts: (1) A thirteen page alphabetical "List of Libraries," public and private, mentioned in the geographical section as possessing issues of papers; (2) An 175 page alphabetical "Index of Titles" of papers, and; (3) An 142 page "Index of Printers." The last is actually an index of printers, publishers and editors and unique because Dr. Brigham has gone to great effort to discover first names wherever omitted in the original imprint. By diligent search of early town directories, local manuscript records, death and marriage notices and other likely sources he has recovered hundreds of these missing first names and thereby greatly increased our knowledge of the personnel behind the early American press.

Discerning religious historians will come to recognize the value of these volumes for their own work. That only thirty of the 2,120 papers listed bear obvious religious titles will lead many to by-pass the early American press as a likely source of religious information. This will be a grave mistake. In this early period the specialized religious press had not yet come of age. To 1820 each paper carried its own religious column or columns. By following these columns week by week the trained scholar may gather a religious narrative possessing three invaluable historical qualities: (1) contemporaneity, (2) continuity, and (3) variety. No other type of source material offers these three qualities in comparable balance. It is to be hoped that a number of enterprising young minds capable of turning impulsive and opinionative accounts to historical purposes will soon begin to explore this great unused store of religious data.

Divinity School,
McMaster University.

Gaylord P. Albaugh.

RECENT ARTICLES ON CHURCH HISTORY

COMPILED BY J. H. NICHOLS AND M. L. HUTCHINS

ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL

- J. S. Bezzant, "The Rise of Christianity," *The Church Quarterly Review*, July-September, 1947. 146-154.
- Robert M. Grant, "A Note on Papias," *Anglican Theological Review*, July, 1947. 171-172.
- Hillyer H. Straton, "Melito of Sardis, Preacher Extraordinary," *Anglican Theological Review*, July, 1947. 167-170.
- Joan Danielou, "Saint Irénée et les origines de la théologie de l'histoire," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, April-May-June, 1947. 227-231.
- Morton S. Enslin, "Irenaeus: mostly Prolegomena," *The Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1947. 127-166.
- Jules Lebreton, "La Théologie de la Trinité chez Clement d'Alexandrie," (cont. and concluded), *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, April-May-June, 1947. 180-226.
- E. Paratore, "Tertuliano e Minucio," *Ricerche Religiose*, June, 1947. 132-159.
- Morton S. Enslin, "Puritan of Carthage," [Tertullian], *The Journal of Religion*, July, 1947. 197-212.
- Martin P. Nelsson, "Greek Mysteries in the Confession of St. Cyprian," *The Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1947. 167-176.
- Eric Peterson, "Le traitement de la rage par les Élésaïtes d'après Hippolyte," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, April-May-June, 1947. 232-238.
- A. Pincherle, "Due postille sul donatismo," *Ricerche Religiose*, June, 1947. 160-164.
- M. Richard, "Saint Athanase et la psychologie du Christ selon les Ariens," *Mélanges de Science Religieuse*, 1947, Cahier I. 5-54.
- Gustave Bardy, "Sur les anciennes traductions latines de Saint Athanase," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, April-May-June, 1947. 239-242.
- Dom G. Charvin, "Bulletin d'Histoire Monastique," *Revue Mabillon*, January-May, 1947. 89-104.
- Léon Christiani, "Essai sur les origines du costume ecclésiastique," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. I, 1947. 69-80.
- Christian Courtois, "Une sainte suspecte: Ste. Olive de Palerme ou de Tunis," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. I, 1947. 63-68.
- René Aigrain, "Sur quelques inscriptions d'églises de l'époque byzantine," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. I, 1947. 18-27.
- René-Jean Hesbert, "L' 'Antiphonale Missarum' de L'ancien rit bénéventain," (cont.), *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1947, Fascicle II & III. 153-210.
- Dom Bernard Capelle, "Pérennité de saint Benoît," *Revue Générale Belge*, August, 1947. 510-516.

- Ottorino Bertolini, "La caduta del Primicerio (771) nelle versioni dei contemporanei, e le correnti antilongobarde e filolongobarde in Roma alla fine del pontificato di Stefano III (771-72)" *Revista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, May-August, 1947. 227-262.
- Gustave Neyron, "Charlemagne, les papes et l'Orient," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. I, 1947. 251-263.
- John Hennig, "Irish Saints in Early German Literature," *Speculum*, July, 1947. 358-374.
- Maurice David, "Gotland, l'île aux cent églises," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. I, 1947. 93-118.
- Howard R. Patch, "The Beginnings of the Legend of Boethius," *Speculum*, July, 1947. 443-445.
- Séverin Salaville, "Messe et Communion d'après les Typika monastiques byzantins du Xe au XIVe siècle," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. I, 1947. 282-298.
- Joseph Calmette, "L'âge de Louis VI," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. I, 1947. 36-39.
- D. O. Lottin, "Nouveaux fragments théologique de l'école d'Anselme de Laon. Deux manuscrits d'Oxford," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, January, 1947. 5-31.
- Fr. Spedalieri, "Anselmus au Gaunilo," *Gregorianum*, 1947. 55-77.
- Dom J. Leclercq, "Inédits bernardins dans un manuscrit d'Engelberg," *Revue Mabillon*, January-May, 1947. 1-16.
- D. E. De Clerck, "Droit de démon et nécessité de la Redemption. Les écoles d'Abelard et de Pierre Lombard," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, January, 1947. 32-64.
- Scholasticus, "The History of Catharism," *The Church Historical Review*, July-September, 1947. 155-160.
- Walter J. Ong, "Wit and Mystery: a Revaluation in Medieval Latin Hymnody," *Speculum*, July, 1947. 310-341.
- H. Maisonneuve, "Un conflit juridique dans la Chrétienté de XIIIe siècle," *Mélanges de Science Religieuse*, Cahier I, 1947. 55-74.
- B. O'Sullivan, "The Dominicans in Medieval Dublin," *Dublin Historical Record*, June-August, 1947. 41-58.
- Samuel H. Cross, "The Mosaic Eucharist of St. Michael's," (Kiev) *The American Slavic and East European Review*, 1947. 56-61.
- D. O. Lottin, "Le Commentaire d'Alexandre de Halès sur les Sentences," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, January, 1947. 93-95.
- P. de Letter, "St. Thomas on Perfect Contrition and Venial Sin," *Theological Studies*, September, 1947. 492-494.
- Barnard J. F. Lonergan, "The Concept of Verbum in the Writings of St. Thomas, III," *Theological Studies*, September, 1947. 404-444.
- Victorin Doucet, "The Authenticity of the Summa," *Franciscan Studies*, September, 1947. 274-312.
- Fr. Pelster, "Literar-historische Probleme der Quodlibeta des hl. Thomas von Aquin," *Gregorianum*, 1947. 78-100.
- Allen B. Wolter, "The 'Theologism' of Duns Scotus," *Franciscan Studies*, September, 1947. 257-273.

- Aidan Carr, "Poverty in Perfection according to St. Bonaventure," *Franciscan Studies*, September, 1947. 313-323.
- Rosalind Hill, "Two Northamptonshire Chantries," *The English Historical Review*, April, 1947. 203-208.
- Robert P. Casey, "Constantine Harmenopoulos's Work on Heresy," *Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1947. 207-209.
- Anneliese Maier, "Ein neues Ockham-Manuskript (Die Original-form der 'Expositio aurea')." *Gregorianum*, 1947. 101-153.
- Georg Hofmann, "Unbekannte oder wenig beachtete christliche griechische Inschriften des Mittelalters." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. I, 1947. 233-238.
- P. Hoenen, "Die Geburt der neuen Naturwissenschaft im Mittelalter." *Gregorianum*, 1947. 164-172.
- Stanley Lawrence Greenslade, "John Washington, Prior of Durham (1416-1446)," *Historical Magazine*, September, 1947. 233-245.
- Annie I. Dunlop, "Scottish Student Life in the 15th Century," *Scottish Historical Review*, April, 1947. 47-63.
- Austin Oakley, "Last Days of An Empire," [Eastern] *The Church Quarterly Review*, July-September, 1947. 161-172.
- S. Furloni, "Giovanni da Torquemada e il suo trattato contro i Bogomili," *Ricerche Religiose*, June, 1947. 165-177.
- Albert M. Ammann, "Ein mittelalterlicher Schachtel-Deckel," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Vol. I, 1947. 28-32.
- John M. Lenhart, "Fra Giocondo Da Verona, Architect of St. Peters, Rome," *Franciscan Studies*, September, 1947. 348-350.

REFORMATION AND MODERN

- Paul Peters, "Luther's Text-Critical Study of II Samuel 23:8," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, September, 1947. 641-651.
- Gustaf Wingren, "Geistliches und weltliches Regiment bei Luther," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, July-August, 1947. 263-273.
- Franklin H. Littell, "The Anabaptists and Christian Tradition," *The Journal of Religious Thought*, Spring-Summer, 1947. 167-181.
- Powel M. Dawley, "Henry VIII and the Church: An Essay on Some Aspects of the Reformation in England," *Historical Magazine*, September, 1947. 246-259.
- John M. Lenhart, "Fra Antonio Da Brescia, O. Min.," *Franciscan Studies*, September, 1947. 347.
- Edmond Grin, "Quelque aspects de la pensée de Calvin sur le Saint-Esprit et leurs enseignements pour nous," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, July-August, 1947. 274-288.
- G. Coleman Luck, "Calvin and Servetus," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April-June, 1947. 236-241.
- Paul Ramsey, "A Theory of Virtue According to the Principles of the Reformation," *The Journal of Religion*, July, 1947. 178-196.
- Johann Loserth, "The Anabaptists in Carinthia in the 16th Century," *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, October, 1947. 235-247.

- Robert Friedmann, "Additional Comments on Loserth's Study in Carinthia," *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, October, 1947. 248-251.
- David Hecht and George L. Mosse, "Liturgical Uniformity and Absolutism in the Sixteenth Century," *The Anglican Theological Review*, July, 1947. 158-166.
- Marjorie Fryckberg, "Pirates in the Pews," *Historical Magazine*, September, 1947. 260-266.
- F. Mellosevich, "Molino e Molinos," *Ricerche Religiose*, June, 1947. 97-115.
- Patrick Power, "The Jesuits in Waterford," [Ireland] *Studies*, September, 1947. 271-282.
- D. W. Gundry, "Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester," *The Church Quarterly Review*, July-September, 1947. 125-144.
- F. Ruegg, "Ein bio-bibliographisches Dokument über Bruder Klaus im Riten-Archiv zu Rom," *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Kirchengeschichte*, Fascicle II, 1947. 89-100.
- A. Chèvre, "A propos d'un échange de territoires entre l'Evêque de Bâle et l'Archevêque de Besançon vers les années 1600," (cont. and concluded) *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Kirchengeschichte*, Fascicle II, 1947. 101-121.
- M. Dorothea Jordan, "John Smyth and Thomas Helwys," *The Baptist Quarterly*, April-July, 1947. 187-195.
- Compte de Saint Aulaire, "Mazarin et la guerre," *Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, January-April, 1946. 5-29.
- Theo. Hoyer, "The Historical Background of the Westminster Assembly," *The Concordia Theological Monthly*, August, 1947. 572-591.
- Dom G. Charvin, "La succession de Mazarin a l'Abbaye de Cluny. Le Cardinal Renaud d'Este, 1661-1672," *Revue Mabillon*, January-May, 1947. 17-46.
- Samuel C. McCulloch, "Some Conflicting Views on the Clergy in England in the 17th Century," *Historical Magazine*, September, 1947. 267-277.
- Shelby T. McCloy, "Rationalists and Religion in the 18th Century," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, October, 1947. 467-482.
- Norman Sykes, "The Theology of Benevolence," *Historical Magazine*, September, 1947. 278-291.
- Frank J. Klingberg, "The Expansion of the Anglican Communion in the 18th Century," *Historical Magazine*, September, 1947. 292-301.
- Wesley J. Bligh, "Henry Dowling," (Pioneer Baptist Minister of Tasmania, Australia) *The Chronicle (A Baptist Historical Quarterly)*, October, 1947. 172-179.
- J. W. C. Wand, "Samuel Wilberforce," (1805-1873) *Historical Magazine*, September, 1947. 302-308.
- G. D. Henderson, "Thomas Chalmers as Preacher," *Theology Today*, October, 1947. 346-356.
- A. C. Watters, "History of the British Churches of Christ," *The Shane Quarterly*, April, 1947. 42-112.
- Shane Leslie, "Some Missing Letters of Cardinal Vaughan," *The Dublin Review*, Autumn, 1947. 97-115.

- L. Salvatorelli, "Le relazioni fra Stato e Chiesa nel sec. XIX. II: Restaurazione e Romanticismo," *Ricerche Religiose*, June, 1947. 116-131.
- John Todd, "Why the Primate Lives at Lambeth," *Modern Churchman*, July, 1947. 141-145.
- Kenneth Walker, "Bishops' Clacton: Two Parks and a Palace," *Essex Review*, July, 1947. 123-127.
- Miner Brodhead Stearns, "Protestant Theology Since 1700," (cont.) *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April-June, 1947. 194-213.
- W. Arndt, "Lund," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, October, 1947. 721-738.
- Walter O. Lewis, "Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke, 1870-1947," *The Chronicle (A Baptist Historical Quarterly)*, October, 1947. 186-188.
- Richard Kaups, "The Estonian Baptist Churches, Their Development and Martyrdom," *The Chronicle (A Baptist Historical Quarterly)*, October, 1947. 164-169.
- Johannes Norgaard, "Baptist Churches in Denmark," *The Chronicle (A Baptist Historical Quarterly)*, October, 1947. 146-160.
- "Actes du Saint-Siège," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, July-August, 1947. 755-759.
- "Bibliography on Italian Church History from Beginning to Present," *Revista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, May-August, 1947. 309-348.
- H. L. Stewart, "Religion in Soviet Russia," *The Dalhousie Review*, April, 1947. 45-52.
- J. Calvet, "La vie religieuse en France. Nos Frères enseignants," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, July-September, 1947.
- Howard A. Johnson, "Kierkegaard and Sartre," *The American-Scandinavian Review*, Autumn, 1947. 220-225.

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

- Clifford M. Drury, "A Chronology of Protestant Beginnings in California," *California Historical Society Quarterly*, June, 1947. 163-174.
- "A Chapter List of the Franciscan Province of Tucuman and Paraguay, 1629," *The Americas*, July, 1947. 108-111.
- Pius J. Barth, "Franciscan Education in French North America," *The Americas*, July, 1947. 3-31.
- Clifford K. Shipton, "Puritanism and Modern Democracy," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, July, 1947. 181-198.
- Peter Masten Dunne, "The Record Book of a Lower California Mission," *Mid-America*, July, 1947. 185-200.
- Henry J. Cadbury, "Early Quakerism and Uncanonical Lore," *The Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1947. 177-206.
- Maynard Geiger, "The Scholastic Career and Preaching Apostolate of Fray Junipero Serra, OFM, STD, 1730-1749," *The Americas*, July, 1947. 65-82.
- Clifford M. Lewis, "French Priests in Western Pennsylvania, 1739-1759," *Mid-America*, April, 1947. 92-121.
- Eleanor B. Adams, "The Chapel and Cofradia of Our Lady of Light in Santa Fé," *New Mexico Historical Review*, October, 1947. 237-241.

- John M. Lenhart, "The Double Jurisdiction in French Louisiana (1722-1766)," *Franciscan Studies*, September, 1947. 344-347.
- Maurice W. Armstrong, "The First Protestant Ordination in Canada," *The Dalhousie Review*, April, 1947. 53-59.
- Cyril J. Davey, "The Significance of Thomas Coke," *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, July, 1947. 212-218.
- Nash K. Burger, "Adam Cloud, Mississippi's First Episcopal Clergyman," *Journal of Mississippi History*, April, 1947. 88-97.
- Thomas E. Jessett, "Origins of the Episcopal Church in the Pacific Northwest," *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, September, 1947. 225-244.
- Nettie Lee Benson, "Bishop Marín de Porras and Texas," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, July, 1947. 16-40.
- H. Clifford Fox, trans., "Autobiography of Jacob Conzett," *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, September, 1947. 131-152.
- Willie Greer Todd, "North Carolina Baptists and Slavery," *The North Carolina Historical Review*, April, 1947. 135-159.
- Othneil A. Pendleton, Jr., "Slavery and the Evangelical Churches," (concluded) *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, September, 1947. 153-174.
- John B. Hill, "A Missouri Missionary Faces Obstacles (Extracts from Diary of Timothy Hill, 1851-1860)," (cont.) *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, September, 1947. 175-186.
- Francis J. Tschan, "The Catholic Church in the U. S., 1852-1868; a Survey," *American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, September, 1947. 182-187.
- J. Howard Kauffman, "The Mennonite Community at Fairview, Michigan," *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, October, 1947. 252-275.
- Sister M. Agnes Gertrude, "Italian Immigration into Philadelphia," *American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, September, 1947. 189-208.
- Jerome V. Jacobsen, "Dobrizhoffer: Abipon Missionary," *Mid-America*, July, 1947. 139-184.
- Patrick H. Ahern, "The First Faculty of the Catholic University of America," *The Catholic Historical Review*, July, 1947. 129-157.
- Peter E. Hogan, "Americanism and the Catholic University of America," *The Catholic Historical Review*, July, 1947. 158-190.
- L. Filler, "'Rerum Novarum' and Henry George," *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, July, 1947. 572-573.
- Jules Laroche, "La visite du President Loubet à Rome en 1904. Souvenirs d'un Diplomate," *Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, January-April, 1946. 130-146.
- Justin Wroe Nixon, "Walter Rauschenbusch After Forty Years," *Christendom*, Autumn, 1947. 476-485.
- Willard B. Lippard, "Clarence M. Gallup, 1874-1947," *The Chronicle (A Baptist Historical Quarterly)*, October, 1947. 184.
- Edward A. Mallon, "Sisters of Charity, St. Joseph's Hospital, 1859-1947," *American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, September, 1947. 209-213.

ARTICLES DEALING WITH CHURCH HISTORY 265

William R. Ferguson, "Life of Lenox College," [Iowa], *The Palimpsest*, September, 1947. 257-288.

James W. Foster, "American Associations with All Hallows Church, London," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, September, 1947. 214-217.

MISCELLANEOUS

Martin R. P. McGuire, "A New Introduction to Historical Method," *The Catholic Historical Review*, July, 1947. 220-234.

L. W. Spitz, "History as a Weapon in Controversy," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, October, 1947. 747-762.

Nels F. S. Ferré, "Contemporary Civilization and Christianity," *Christendom*, Autumn, 1947. 429-442.

Winston H. F. Barnes, "On History. I — Historical Inquiry," *The Durham University Journal*, June, 1947. 89-97.

**AMERICAN CONTACTS
WITH THE EASTERN
CHURCHES 1820-1870**

By P. E. Shaw, \$2.00

A history of the Greek Mission of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Episcopal Mission to Constantinople, the work of the A. B. C. F. M. in Turkey and Greece and a history of the indigenous Greek Evangelical Church by an author well-qualified to write on the subject. Most timely in view of the present interest in ecumenical Christianity.

**CONGREGATIONALISM
IN THE DUTCH
NETHERLANDS**

By Raymond P. Stearns, \$2.00

The author presents hitherto unpublished documents relating to the English Congregationalists in Holland. New light on the history of Congregationalism.

**EPISCOPAL
APPOINTMENTS
IN THE REIGN
OF EDWARD II**

By W. E. L. Smith, \$1.50

An exhaustive study based almost entirely upon original material, and filling a need which has not been met hitherto by any other work.

These prices, postage additional, are in effect only on direct orders from

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY
55 Elizabeth Street, Hartford 5, Conn.



